

70213

A N
A N S W E R

To the DISSENTING GENTLEMAN'S
THIRD LETTER
TO THE
REVEREND Mr. WHITE,
WITH SOME
OCCASIONAL REMARKS

U P O N

What he had advanced against the CHURCH
of ENGLAND in his First; especially where
he has attempted to prove *the Church of Jesus
Christ, and the Church of England, to be Consti-
tutions of a quite different Nature:*

S H E W I N G,

The whole of what he has objected to be founded
either on Misrepresentation or Mistake, and sup-
ported by false and inconclusive Reasoning.

By J O H N L A N D O N,
Rector of Nustead and Ifield in Kent.

*How long will ye vex my Soul and break me in Pieces
with Words! These ten Times have ye reproached me:
You are not ashamed that you make yourselves strange
to me. JOB. xix. 2, 3.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. ROBINSON, at the Golden Lion,
in Ludgate-Street. 1758.

[Price Two Shillings.]

T H E
C O N T E N T S.

SECTION I. Of Church Power, Page	
and in whom lodged.	I
II. Of our Constitution in Church and State.	30
III. Of the Sacramental Test.	63
IV. Of Sponsors in Baptism.	71
V. Of Confirmation.	77
VI. The Terms of ministerial Conformity neither hard nor terrible. Lay dissent and the Rise of the Separation, not justifiable.	84
VII. No egregious Absurdity, in rejecting Presbyterian and admitting popish Ordinations.	96
VIII. That the People have not, from Scripture, a Right to chuse their own Pastors.	123
IX. Of the Church's Authority in Controversies of Faith.	143
X. Of the Posture in which our Lord and his Apostles eat the Sacramental Supper,	152
The CONCLUSION.	157

SECRET



O F
CHURCH POWER, &c.

S I R,



IN your first Answer to Mr. *White's* three Letters, you tell him, That *the Controversy betwixt the Church of England and the Dissenters, as you apprehend, may easily be brought to a plain and short Issue. That it turns upon the single Point of the XXth Article of our Church (viz.) That the Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Matters of Faith. (a)* In the Article it is Controversies of Faith: but more of that hereafter. Upon what you had here advanced, Mr. *White* very justly observed, That the putting the Particulars in dispute between us, upon this one general Issue, *that of the Authority of the Church*, would not Answer the End proposed by it; because that was a Point lying open to so much quibbling and distinguishing,

B that

(a) Dissent. Gent. 1 Lett. p. 41.

that it might be controverted by a perverse Adversary without End. (a) But not satisfied with this Reason, nor with what he had however writ, in Defence of the Authority of the Church, upon this Occasion, (b) you urge it again in the Beginning of your third Letter, That *the Issue of the Debate betwixt the Church and the Dissenters, depends absolutely and intirely upon this single Point.* "Is there any Lawgiver or King
 " in the Church of God besides Jesus Christ,
 " or, is there not? Is there Power or Authority vested in any Man or Body of Men on
 " Earth, to make and injoin new Rites of
 " Christian Worship, and new Terms of Christian Fellowship, besides what Christ, the
 " only Lawgiver, hath himself made or
 " joined; or is there not? (c)" If by asking these Questions, you mean, whether any Person or Persons have Authority to make new positive Institutions of equal Validity with those enjoined by Jesus Christ? I readily answer, there are not any. But if by it you understand, whether he has left any with Authority to regulate the external Worship of his Church, and to make such Rules and Ordinances, that all Things in it may *be done to edifying, and decently and in Order?* Then I say he has. For it is not to be supposed, that our Saviour would have left his Church, with Regard to the Externals of it, in a State of Anarchy; but would either himself have given such Rules as should precisely have served to regulate, upon all Occasions, that external Worship of its Members, which it is their Duty to pay him; or, have left a discretionary

(a) 1 Def. p. 8.

(b) 1 Def. from p. 8. to 25.

(c) Dissent. Gent. 3 Lett. p. 3.

tionary Power in it to make such as might, from time to time, best suit with the Circumstances, Constitution or Genius of any People.

You tell us indeed, that *Christ and his Apostles, the great Founders of the Christian Church, originally drew up, published and established an excellent common Rule of Discipline and Worship, by which all Churches hold themselves obliged to walk; and which they left as a common Rule, the only common Rule, and a perfect common Rule, for the Use of all future Ages; (viz) the Holy Scriptures. (a)* Again, you call the Power of making Rites and Ceremonies, "A most dangerous and important Power; not fit to be trusted, and therefore, we may be assured, never was trusted with any fallible uninspired Men. Jesus Christ surely, the supreme Bishop and only Head of his Church, well knew what Institutions were most for its Edification; and what Ceremonies and Rites would best promote the Order and Decency of its Worship; and either by himself, or by his inspired Apostles, has left a perfect Plan of both." (b) Much to the same Purpose argued Mr. Cartwright, one of your Predecessors in the Time of Queen Elizabeth; and was very judiciously and largely answered by Mr. Hooker. (c) Mr. Hooker, Sir, was a Man whose Judgment is so respected in the World, that if, instead of reviving this Objection, you had applied yourself to obviate the Force of his Reasoning against it, your Readers might very well have excused you; and you must have appeared to most of them a more candid and ingenuous Opponent.

B 2

But

(a) Dissent. Gent. 2 Lett. p. 18.
Gent. 3 Lett. p. 10.

(b) Dissent.
(c) Eccles. Polity; Lib. 3.

But to go on dressing up old Objections, as you have done almost throughout your three Letters, without taking the least Notice of the Answers that have been made to them, is certainly never the Way to come to an End of our Dispute. But to shew you, that you yourselves do not make the Holy Scripture your Rule, I shall point out to you many Particulars even in your own public Worship, which could never have been taken from thence. As for Instance, where is it ordered in the Holy Scriptures that public Edifices should be built for the People to assemble in for the Service of God? Where is it appointed that those of respective Districts should meet together for this Purpose? Where is it enjoined that these Assemblies should be held, at least every Lord's Day, about ten o'Clock in the Morning, and about three in the Afternoon? Where is it directed that Pulpits should be raised in the Places of public Worship, and that the officiating Minister should ascend them, and from thence preach, and expound the Scripture, as the Manner is; with several other Particulars in which your Churches, as well as others, are generally agreed? Again, in what Part or Parts of the New Testament do you find it ordered, that the Service of God in his Church, should be precisely performed in every Circumstance just as it is with you, any more than it is with us? I have laid these Things before you, to let you see, that the Holy Scripture is really not your Directory, with Regard to the Manner in which your public Worship is performed.

That the holy Scriptures have either expressly declared, or else that whatever Things generally
 necessary

necessary to be done, are fairly to be deduced from thence, is undeniably true. But then the Form and Manner in which they are to be performed are left undetermined thereby. Now the Form and Manner in which Things (generally necessary to be done) are performed, are the Rites and Ceremonies; the decreeing of which our twentieth Article asserts to belong to the Church. And I hope from what has been already said, it appears, that you must have exercised this Power in your own Churches, though you so strenuously dispute the Right of the Church of *England* to it. But that the holy Scripture, in appointing even Things generally necessary to be done, has delivered itself only in general Terms is evident, from the two positive Institutions our blessed Saviour has been pleased to appoint, (*viz.*) Baptism, and his last Supper. For, in the Sacrament of Baptism, he has only ordered, that those who would become his Disciples should be baptized, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; without giving any express Directions whether it should be by Immersion or Sprinkling. In the Administration therefore of this Sacrament, Churches have been divided, each following its respective Judgment herein. Some making Use of the former; but others, and that the far greater Part, of Sprinkling, as appearing more commodious both for Ministers and People; among whom, the Generality of dissenting Churches may, I believe, be reckoned. Again, when he instituted the Sacrament of his last Supper, he only took Bread, and, when he had given Thanks, brake it, and gave it to his Disciples; and in like Manner

the Cup; ordering them to do it in Remembrance of him; but then the Posture, Time and Place, and some other Particulars relating to the Manner in which it is to be celebrated, are left quite undetermined by him; wherefore Churches have all along used their own Discretion in appointing them. But if the Manner in which it was done by our Saviour and his Disciples, is to be looked upon as our Directory in every Circumstance, then ought it to be celebrated in a recumbent Posture; which, as far as appears, was that then made Use of both by our Saviour and his Apostles; and that too in an upper Room; and after a full Meal; the Bread should be unleavened, and some Water mixed with Wine; for, if I am not mistaken, all these Circumstances were observed by our blessed Saviour upon this Occasion. But are they still retained by you in the Administration of this Sacrament? I never heard that they are; but, on the contrary, that in this you have deviated in many Particulars from the Manner in which our Saviour did it, and in both it and Baptism, you have taken up with the Use of others, which were never enjoined by him, as well as we. But you would have us believe, that the Rules and Orders for your public Worship are not so strictly insisted on as those of the Church of *England* are. For, in Answer to Mr. *White*, when he put *your long sweeping Cloak*, in Contrast with our Surplice, you say, *that had your Cloak been the Occasion of a thousandth Part of the Distractions and Confusions in the Church, as our Surplice has been, and swept so many worthy Persons from their Livings and Ministry in it, you should have had the Grace, you hope, soon to treat it*

it as a *Besom of Destruction*, and have doomed it to the *Flames* (a). And so, I make no doubt, would the Church of *England* have done long ago by the *Surplice*, had that been the only Exception, which those that left it had to its Service. Again, you tell us, you believe, that there is not among your Ministers, one in five Hundred, who would refuse to give the Sacrament either standing or kneeling, to any one, who thought either of these the fittest Posture of receiving (b). Whether you are strictly just in your Calculation here, or not, I do not know; yet I cannot help thinking, that, were you yourself one of your Ministers, you might without the Breach of Charity be looked upon as an Exception to it. For how can it be imagined that you, with a safe Conscience, could administer this Sacrament to any one kneeling, who are pleased to call it, and that, as it seems, in no very favourable Sense, an *adoring* Posture (c). But the Question, Sir, is not whether you are as strict in requiring Obedience to your Rules and Orders, as we are to ours; But whether you have not your Rules and Orders, and that too of your own devising, for the Administration of your public Service, as well as we? For if you have, you have indisputably exercised that very Power claimed for the Church in our XX. Article. However, admitting that in some few Particulars you may not be so strict as the Church of *England*; but that if some among you should desire to receive the Sacrament, even in a recumbent Posture, many of your Ministers

B 4

would

(a) Dissent. Gent. 2 Letter, p. 24. (b) Dissent. Gent. 1 Letter, p. 21. (c) Dissent. Gent. 3 Letter, p. 90.

would indulge them it. Yet I cannot think they would be so complying upon every Occasion. For, what if a few in most of your Congregations should require also that the Bread should be unleavened ; that some Water should be mixed with the Wine ; that it should not be administered in the Morning, in the Meetings, after Divine Service ; but that some upper Room should be provided ; and there to be celebrated after a Supper ? I fancy, though they could from Scripture, your pretended Directory, plead our Saviour's Example for all this, it would be told them, that there was no such Custom in your Churches ; and for ought that appears, they must either receive it in your Way, or go without it. For it is not to be imagined, that you would so lightly unsettle the Frame of your public Service, to humour the Caprice of a few, when the major Part of your People were very well satisfied with it as it was, and would probably be greatly scandalized at any such Innovations. But then, might not those Persons put the same Questions to you, as you have done to us ? “ Is there any *other* Law-giver or King in the Church of God, besides “ Jesus Christ ; or, is there not ? Is there *Power* “ and *Authority* vested in any Man, or Body “ of Men on Earth, to make and to enjoin “ *new Rites* of Christian *Worship*, and *new* “ *Terms* of Christian Fellowship, besides what “ Christ, the *only* Lawgiver, hath *himself* made “ and enjoined ; or is there not ? ” For if your Churches exercise the same Power, in Respect of the foregoing Particulars, that the Church of *England* does ; ought not they likewise to give their Reasons for so doing, and to shew
by

by what Authority those Things have been done by them, and who it was that gave them that Authority? You might then, you see, have asked at Home for an Answer to these your Questions, as well as of us, and also to the two following, which you seem to think so very embarrassing, (*viz.*) 1. Where to place this Power? 2. How to limit and confine it? As to limiting and confining this Power, I observe, that the two general Directions St. Paul gave the *Corinthians*, for correcting some Irregularities in their public Worship, will be abundantly sufficient. *Let all Things be done to edifying. Let all Things be done decently and in Order (a).* But still it may be asked who are to be Judges, whether Things are to be done to edifying, and decently, and in Order, or not? Why, who are more proper to be vested with this Power, than those, whom St. Paul desires might be esteemed *as the Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God (b)*? In Answer then to your Question, where to place this Power? I say that it is in the Bishops and Pastors to appoint the Form and Manner, in which the Service of God in his Church is to be performed; that is, as it is in our twentieth Article, to decree the Rites and Ceremonies thereof. But then, whatever they do, in these Matters, must be done with the Consent and Concurrence of the ruling Powers; by whom I mean those Powers, wherein the legislative and executive Authority of any People is lodged; by whose Sanction only, an uniform Obedience *can be required* to what they shall at any Time appoint or decree. And therefore, when speaking of the

(a) 1 Cor. xiv. 26, 40.

(b) 1 Cor. iv. 1.

the XXXIX Articles, if by saying that, “ Whether they were passed in Convocation, or not, with Regard to their Authority, is of no Moment at all. Their (that is, the Bishops and Clergy’s) unanimous *Assent*, adding not the least Grain to their Obligation on the Subject ;” you mean, that they have no Power to oblige the People to submit to their Determinations, without the Authority of a civil Magistrate ; you say what is very right ; but at the same Time what was quite unnecessary : because this is a Power, which the Clergy of the Church of *England* have never once pretended to claim, since the Reformation. Also, you quote the XXXIVth Article, as expressly declaring that our Church Ceremonies were ordained by the Authority of the Civil Magistrate ; though the Article itself speaks of Traditions and Ceremonies ordained and approved by common Authority. But let the Article mean just as you have made it ; and let our XXXth Canon acknowledge our Ceremonies to have been prescribed by public Authority ; if by all this you would let us know that our Liturgy, with its Rites and Ceremonies, was ordained, that is, legally established by the Authority of the Civil Powers, it is what no one has ever denied. For notwithstanding it had been assented to by the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, yet were not the People obliged to receive it, till it had also obtained the Sanction of the Legislature. But if your Design was to persuade us that the Liturgy was established by the Parliament alone, without the Consent of the Convocation, it is more than can be inferred from that Article and Canon ; and more, than what your other Reasons

sons do amount to the Proof of. The Reasons you have assigned, why the Liturgy must have been established by the Civil Magistrate alone, without the Convocation, are; because that in the Reign of King *Edward VI.* the Majority of the Bishops and inferior Clergy were on the Side of Popery. And that, when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown, they were still more generally, and more firmly attached unto it, to such a Degree, that it was not to be expected that a Convocation composed of such would ever have assented to the reformed Liturgy, had it been laid before them. This I think is the Force of your Arguing. But the Authorities upon which it depends, I shall now proceed to examine; and prove.

I. That the Majority of the Bishops and inferior Clergy were not so much on the Side of Popery in the Reign of King *Edward VI.* as to lay the Civil Magistrate under any Sort of Necessity to proceed in the Reformation without them. And,

II. Admitting the Bishops and inferior Clergy, when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown, to have been ever so firmly attached to Popery; that the Liturgy established, by her and her Parliament, could not be called, properly speaking, a Liturgy established by the Civil Magistrate alone. But,

I. That the Majority of the Bishops and inferior Clergy were not so much on the Side of Popery in the Reign of King *Edward VI.* as to lay the Civil Magistrate under any Sort of Necessity

Necessity to proceed in the Reformation without them.

Notwithstanding King *Henry VIII.* did abolish the tyrannical Power of the Pope, and reduce that of his own Clergy within its proper Bounds; yet he did not deprive them of that Privilege which of Right belonged to them. For in all the Alterations he made afterwards in the Church, and in the several Steps he took towards the Reformation, so far as it went in his Time, he seems to have done nothing without the Concurrence of the Convocation (*a*). In this Reign Things were carried with a very high Hand over the Clergy; and yet if the several Changes, which were even then made in the State of the Church, were not effected without them in Convocation, we may very well infer, that their Determinations in such Cases were looked upon as necessary. And therefore it ought not to be immediately concluded, that what was done in the Reformation in the succeeding Reign, under a more mild and gentle Prince, was done without them, though the Records of what they did in it were not at present to be found. The Acts of the Convocation in the Reign of King *Edward VI.* it must be confessed, were either very imperfectly taken, or have been in great Measure lost, or destroyed, probably by those who had no Mind they should be known to Posterity. But however, what Remains we have of them, are sufficient to satisfy us (contrary to what Mr. *Neal* your informant says) that the Majority of the Bishops and

(*a*) Archb. Wake's State of the Church, pages 489, 490, 491, 589, 590, 591.

and inferior Clergy were not so much on the Side of Popery as to put the Civil Powers under any Necessity of proceeding in the Reformation by their own Authority alone, without the Consent and Concurrence of the Convocation; which sat as often as the Parliament did throughout that whole Reign. For the first Parliament of King *Edward VI.* met the fourth Day of *November* in the first, and was continued by several Prorogations till the fifteenth of *April*, in the sixth Year of his Reign. The Convocation began the fifth of the same *November*, and was not dissolved till the sixteenth of the same *April*, a Day after the Parliament, (a) so that it sat the whole Time that Parliament did.

In the first Session of this Parliament, Cap. 1. The Act for receiving the Communion in both Kinds was passed. In the Second, Cap. 1. the first Act of Uniformity, and Cap. 21. of the same, the Act to make it lawful for Priests to marry. And in the fourth Session, Cap. 1. the second Act of Uniformity. And that the Convocation was not quite unconcerned in these Bills, and that the Bishops and inferior Clergy were not so much inclined to Popery as you have represented them, we find, seeing that during the first Session of this Parliament, the receiving the Lord's Supper in both Kinds was consented to by the Clergy in Convocation, before it was made a Statute of the Realm. (b) And it was also resolved in that Convocation, that it was unlawful to prohibit Priests from marrying, before the Bill was brought into Parliament to make it lawful for them so to do. (c) And not-

(a) State of the Church, pages 592, 598.
P. 592, 593.

(c) Ibid. p. 593, 594.

(b) Ibid.

notwithstanding it does not appear, that either of the Liturgies then established was consented to by it; yet, since it was then sitting when the Acts of Uniformity for the establishing both were passed; and, since it was customary for such Things to be laid before it for its Consent and Approbation; nay, since from the very Beginning of that Convocation, *the lower House had petitioned the Upper, that for a better Expedition of divine Service, they might have Liberty to peruse such Books, as by the Command of Henry the Eighth, had been drawn up by certain Prelates and other learned Men, for the Alteration of the Service in the Church, and for the convenient and uniform Order therein, to be set forth accordingly* (a), it plainly shews, that the Representatives of the inferior Clergy, at least, were then desirous, that a *convenient and uniform Order* for the Service in the Church might be set forth; and consequently, all these Circumstances put together and duely weighed, do certainly afford a very strong Presumption, that the reformed Liturgies and Service Books then were regularly laid before the Convocation for its Consent and Approbation, though the Records of its being done may be lost or destroyed, and that they were not established *by the Parliament alone* without it. Let us now proceed to consider, what was done in the Reformation by Queen *Elizabeth* and her Parliament; in doing of which,

II. I shall make it appear, admitting the Bishops and Clergy to have been so firmly attached to Popery as you have represented them, that the Liturgy established by them could not, however, properly speaking, be called a Liturgy

(a) State of the Church, p. 592.

turgy established by *the civil Magistrate alone*. For, what was done by Queen *Elizabeth*, was only taking off the Repeal that had been made by Queen *Mary*, of the Act of Uniformity, and resettling the reformed Church upon the same Establishment it had been on in the Time of King *Edward VI.* when, whatever had been enacted by the Civil Magistrate in the Reformation, I hope I have given very good Reasons for believing, had been first regularly assented to by the Convocation. And consequently, what was done by her and her Parliament upon this Occasion, cannot properly be said to have been done by the Civil Magistrate alone, without the Convocation. It must not however be dissimbled, that whilst this was transacting by Queen *Elizabeth*, a Question happened to be moved, which of the two Liturgies that had been in Use in King *Edward VI.* Time, should be re-established? Whereupon she issued out a Commission to several learned Divines to examine and compare them both together. Who, after some Time spent therein, came to a Resolution in Favour of the Second; which was re-established accordingly, with two or three no very material Alterations: Such as leaving out a harsh Sentence in the Litany against the Pope; the Change or Addition of some certain Lessons for Sundays; and the uniting both the Form of Words used at delivering the Elements in the Sacrament, in the first and second Common Prayer Books of King *Edward VI.* But then these were Alterations of no such great Importance, as to have made it necessary for a Convocation to be called on purpose to make them, had the Bishops and inferior Clergy been

as firmly attached to the Protestant Cause as they were to Popery.

But were we to admit, that some Things in the Reformation of King *Edward* and Queen *Elizabeth* were not so regular as they ought to have been, (though I think I have given very good Reason for believing that they were) yet would not the present Church of *England*, as resettled soon after the Restoration under King *Charles II.* be at all affected by it. Because, then all the Bishops and Clergy were truly Protestant, and the Liturgy, with all its Alterations and Additions, which is the very same we now have, was approved of and unanimously assented to by the provincial Synods of both *Canterbury* and *York*, before the Act of Uniformity was passed. Upon this Act of Uniformity it is, that the present Church of *England*, against which your Attack is made, does really rest, and not upon those of either King *Edward* or Queen *Elizabeth*. And till you can shake this Pillar, which is not to be done by barely asserting (for proved it you have not) that, in the Beginning, the Reformation was effected by the Civil Magistrate alone without the Convocation; but, by shewing, that the Establishment of the present Church under King *Charles II.* was made also by them alone, without the preceding Consent and Concurrence of the Clergy: which would be contrary to the most authentic History of those Times. I say, till you have done this, the present Church of *England* will, I make no doubt, be esteemed by all unprejudiced Persons quite different from what you have taken the Liberty to call it, a Church constituted framed and established by the Civil

Civil Magistrate, and only by him (a). A Church that depends entirely upon the Acts and Authority of Parliament for its very Essence and Frame (b).

The Reformation of the Church of *England* was carried on and effected by that Authority whereby the Reformation of all national Churches ought to be, by the Spiritual and Temporal conjointly; the Bishops and Clergy appointing and directing the Manner, the Legislature giving their Approbation and Sanction to it. And the Spiritual and Temporal Powers considered as acting thus together in the Establishment of this Church, shews the several Questions you have put, with Respect to the Power of it, to be intirely without any Occasion; and also your Declamation upon the Danger of allowing a Power to be in the Church (by which, if I take you right, you mean the Bishops and Clergy alone, though it be contrary to the Definition of the Church given in the XIXth Article) to decree Rites and Ceremonies, to be quite needless: Because, it never was the Doctrine of this Church, since the Reformation, that any *one Bishop*, or *junto of Bishops*, had Authority to make what new Rites and Ceremonies they pleased, and to oblige the People to submit to them, till they had been first duely assented to by them in their Legislative Capacity.

Having now considered the Arguments whereby you have endeavoured to prove the Church of *England* to have been *constituted formed and established by the Civil Magistrate, and only by him*; and shewed them, I hope, to be without Authority; I shall proceed to examine the Propriety of those Contrasts you have made between

(a) Diff. Gent. 3 Letter, p. 4. (b) Ibid. 1 Letter, p. 14.

some Ceremonies it has retained, and some which it has omitted. *You defy any Man to shew the Consecration of Earth to cover the Body when dead, to be an edifying and decent Rite; but the Consecration of Water to sprinkle it when Living to be a ridiculous and foolish Foppery. And again, to say, why Spittle and Salt in Baptism, are not as instructive Ceremonies, as the Sign of the Cross. And moreover, why a Bishop has not as much Power, according to antient Custom, to exorcise the Devil before Baptism, as to lay on Hands after it, to impart the Graces of the holy Ghost (a).*

As to your defying any one to shew the Consecration of Earth to cover the Body when dead to be an edifying and decent Rite, but the Consecration of Water to sprinkle it when living to be a ridiculous and foolish Foppery; I observe, that had you but proved the Earth to be consecrated in the Church of *England* to cover the Body when dead, with the same superstitious Intention that Water is consecrated in the Church of *Rome* to sprinkle it when living, I believe no one would have been so hardy as to have entered the Lists with you. Water is consecrated in the Church of *Rome* to sprinkle the Bodies of the Living, in order to purify them from the Pollutions of Sin; and moreover, if it be not greatly misrepresented, to preserve them from the Power and malignant Influence of evil Spirits. The first gives to a human Institution an Efficacy equal with those of Christ, which is absolutely unwarrantable; and by the next, the Minds of Men may not only be brought to withdraw their Hope and Confidence from God their immediate Defender, and to place their Expectations
of

(a) Diff. Gent. 3 Letter, p. 10, 11.

of Safety and Protection upon unwarrantable Mediums, but may also be induced to believe, that God, now under the Gospel Dispensation, does permit evil Spirits personally to afflict and torment his faithful Servants; which I think is a Notion contrary to sound Doctrine. But, if the Church of *England* does consecrate the Earth wherewith the Bodies of the Dead are covered, Where is it once taught, or even insinuated, that the Dead are thereby rendered either better or worse; or that it is to prevent their being carried away, or being otherwise disturbed by wicked Spirits? No, Sir, the Church of *England*, by so solemnly setting apart from profane and common Use, the Ground wherewith her Dead are to be covered, designs to keep up, in the Minds of its Members, the Belief of the Resurrection. For the shewing that Respect it does, even to the very Earth where the Bodies of the Dead are laid, must naturally lead Men to consider, that those Bodies are not looked upon as Things of no further Account, but that they will be raised again. Now the Belief of the Resurrection is an Article of that Importance, that no Church ought to be blamed which makes use of every Occasion to inculcate it, by Arguments applied to Sense as well as Reason. By this Time possibly you may perceive, that the Things you have here put in Contrast, are by no means proper for it. The one tending to fill the Minds of People with erroneous Notions; the other to bring frequently to their Remembrance that Article of their Faith, which the oftener they think upon, the more likely are they to make good and sincere Christians.

But let us see whether you have been any thing more happy in the Choice of those you have pitched upon, in the next Place, for the same Purpose; which are, Spittle and Salt in Baptism in the Church of *Rome*, and the Sign of the Cross in the Church of *England*. The Intention of the Church of *England*, in ordering those who are received by it into the Congregation of Christ's Flock, to be *signed with the Sign of the Cross*, is *in Token*, that hereafter *they shall not be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his Banner against Sin, the World, and the Devil, and to continue Christ's faithful Soldiers and Servants unto their Lives End* (a). These contain the strict and indispensable Duty of every Christian. And as the Church intended by the Use of a sensible (and I might have added a suitable) Sign, to imprint the Thoughts of them more lastingly upon, and to bring them more frequently into, the Minds of those who are admitted into it, the End at least proposed by it must be allowed to be good. But whether the Design of the Church of *Rome* in using Spittle and Salt be equally so or not, I own I do not know. That our first reformed Bishops and Clergy, who must undoubtedly be allowed to have been very well acquainted with it, did not think it was, is plain: For, if they had, they would, in all probability, have retained the Use of the one as well as of the other. However, when you have made it appear that it is, (which certainly you must have thought yourself able to do, before you would have given so bold a Defiance) I shall readily acknowledge you to have been in the Right.

(a) Office of public Baptism.

Right: But till then you must excuse me, if I cannot help thinking it somewhat injudiciously done, to set the Use of Salt and Spittle against that of the Cross in Baptism. The same impropriety I hope to make you appear Guilty of, *in defying any Man upon Earth, to say, why a Bishop has not as much Power, according to ancient Custom, to exorcise the Devil before Baptism, as to lay on Hands after it to impart the Graces of the Holy Ghost.* That the Practice of exorcising Persons before they were baptized was very ancient in the Church, is undeniably true. But then there does not appear to have been any Warrant for it in Scripture. Whereas, the laying on of Hands to impart the Graces of the Holy Ghost is warranted by the Example of the Apostles, who are succeeded by the Bishops in their Office, so far as it concerned the spiritual Government of the Church; and is reckoned by St. Paul among *the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ (a)*. Now, if the laying on of Hands by the Bishops in Confirmation has its Authority from Scripture, and Exorcism not, there is a very justifiable Reason, even you yourself being judge, for believing, that the one may be performed with Effect, but the other without any at all.

There are some few Particulars more towards the End of this Section, with Remarks upon which I shall conclude what I have to say farther upon it. You make very fair Promises, how conformable you will be, when the Church of *England* is proved to have Power to decree *Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith.* What is to be understood by Rites

C 3

and

(a) Hebr. vi. 1. vid. Beza. in Locum.

and Ceremonies, and how far the Church has a Power to decree them, has been already shewed, where it has been observed, that they belong only to the Form and Manner in which positive Duties are performed ; and that where these are left undetermined by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, there (unless we could suppose the Church to have been left in a State of Confusion) is all the Reason in the World for believing, that there must be a Power in it, to appoint such as shall seem most agreeable to the Constitution or Genius of any People. And this very Power I have made appear to have been exercised even in your Churches, by observing, that your Mode of publick Worship must have been of human Institution, because it is not expressly appointed in the holy Scripture any more than ours. But there is one Mistake which seems to have misled you throughout your three Letters. You have erroneously taken it for granted, that by Church we mean the Bishops and Clergy alone, and that these have a Power to decree whatever Rites and Ceremonies they please, to which the People are implicitly to submit. Though this be neither the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, nor the Language of its Articles. For in the XIXth Article, the Church is defined to be a
 “ Congregation of faithful Men, in which the
 “ pure Word of God is preached, and the
 “ Sacraments be duly ministered, according to
 “ Christ’s Ordinance in all those Things that
 “ of Necessity are requisite to the same.” Now, nothing is more evident than that, in this Article, the Church is supposed to consist of two different Orders, *viz.* of those whose Business it is to administer the Sacraments, and to preach the
 Word,

Word, as well as of such as are to hear that Word, and to have those Sacraments administered to them; that is, of Ministers and People. And, consequently, when in the very next Article it is said, that the Church has a Right to decree Rites and Ceremonies; there the Compilers of it must in all Reason be supposed to have spoken in Reference to that Definition of the Church, which they had given in the Article immediately preceding, and to have included both Ministers, and People; yet so as each to keep to their proper Province. The Ministers, consisting of Bishops and Clergy, appointing what Rites and Ceremonies are proper to be used; the People, giving their Assent unto them, in their legislative Capacity. And this Notion of the Church, and this Manner of proceeding in it, is most agreeable to the Practice of the Apostles themselves. For, in that Synod, spoken of *Acts* xv. as held at *Jerusalem*, to determine whether the Gentile Converts should be circumcised, and keep the Law of *Moses*, we find, that the Apostles alone debated upon the Matter, and came first to a Conclusion upon it; and afterwards it appears to have been assented to by the Brethren, who were assembled upon that Occasion. For, the Decree of that Synod, though apparently made by the Apostles alone, was yet sent away in the Name of the Apostles and *Elders* and Brethren. And I hope I have proved the present Church of *England* to have acted always according to this System, by and with the concurrent Authority of the temporal as well as spiritual Powers thereof. However, Sir, if the Power to decree Ceremonies be such an Obstacle with you

against the Church of *England*, How comes it to pass, that it is not so likewise with you against your own, which has exercised this very Power in appointing Sitting at the Communion, which the Authors of the *Admonitions to the Parliament* (in the Reign of *Queen Elizabeth*) who were the Dissenters of those Times, held to betoken Rest, and full Accomplishment of legal Ceremonies in our Saviour Christ (a)? Now, if sitting, with you, in receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be a Token of any Thing, I say, that then it is, to all Intents and Purposes, as much a Ceremony as the Cross in Baptism is with us, which is only to betoken, that the Person upon whom it is made is not to be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ crucified, &c.

But let us see what you will do, if we can but make out this one Point, that the Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies. Why, if our Church commands you to sign yourselves all over with a significant and instructive Cross, you will reverently do it. Before I proceed, I cannot but take Notice, that you speak throughout all your Promises in the plural Number, and take upon you to answer for your Brethren as well as yourself; which I shall make appear, in its proper Place, to be an Engagement of just the same Nature with that which our Sponsors in Baptism enter into. But to return to your Promises. You will cross yourselves all over with a significant and instructive Cross, if our Church commands it. As it is utterly impracticable for any Man to cross himself all over with one Cross, your Manner of Expression, however guarded, might mislead an inattentive

(a) *Hooker's Ecclesiast. Polity. Lib. 5. Sect. 65.*

tentive Reader to imagine, that the Church of *England* had a Disposition to multiply absurd and superstitious Ceremonies to the same Degree, as is done in the Church of *Rome*. If this was your Design, though I do not say it was, (yet you must pardon me, if I cannot help thinking, that you had some such in View, for Reasons which I shall presently give) I say, if you had any such Design, it was highly disingenuous. Because you could have no reasonable Pretence for endeavouring to raise such a wrong, such an unjustifiable, Suspicion in the Minds of your Readers. But what makes it appear probable that you had the Church of *Rome* in View in this Place, and artfully designed to induce your Readers to look upon the Church of *England*, as equally prone with it, to multiply Superstitions, is your saying, that *you will cross yourself all over*. The Church of *Rome* indeed does recommend it to, if not require it of, its Members, to cross themselves very frequently with the Sign of the Cross; and many of them do it very superstitiously, almost upon all Occasions. But where has the Church of *England* once ordered any one of its Members to *cross himself* at all? Our Church requires no Man to be crossed above once, and that not by himself, but by the Minister who officiates at his Baptism. Besides, Sir, could you really persuade yourself, that we could ever believe, you could have so mean an Opinion of our Church, as to think it was likely to lay a greater Stress upon the Size and Largeness of the Cross, than the Cross itself? For these Reasons, though my Suspicions of you may be wrong, you must, I believe, acknowledge, that
you

you had given very justifiable Grounds for entertaining them.

But let us come to your next Promise, which is, that *if our Church bids you worship towards the East, and to think the omnipresent Deity to be more there, than in the West, you will humbly submit.* But pray, Sir, what is this to the present Church of *England*? Against which, I must tell you again, your Attack is made. For in what Part of our present Rubrick, in which of our Canons, do you find it so much as once required of those, who attend its Service, so to do? You say, if it bids you do it. But what Reason had you for suspecting that it would ever bid you do it, when it does it not at present? Had a Compliance with this Rite been strictly insisted upon, you could have promised no more; but as it is not so much as once required, I appeal to yourself, whether your Manner of promising does not seem to carry something more in it, than can be reconciled with the strictest Candour? But as to turning towards the *East*, in Time of divine Service, *Origen*, who lived about the Beginning of the third Century, long before the Corruptions of Popery prevailed, acquaints us, that it was even then the Custom so to do (a). And such a Veneration had he himself for it, that he recommends it to Persons even in their private Devotions (b). I have mentioned this only to shew the Moderation of our Church, in neither expressly forbidding nor requiring, but leaving it to every one's free Choice to observe, or not observe, so ancient and long established a Custom, according as his own

Incli-

(a) *Origen contra Celsum. Lib. 8.*

(b) *Origen in his Treatise of Prayer.*

Inclination should lead, or Judgment determine, him. And certainly it had as much Right to leave People at Liberty in a Matter so indifferent, as your Ministers have to permit such of their Congregations, as should make it their Choice, to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper kneeling; which was a Posture once looked upon by many of you, in a much more heinous Light, than turning to the *East* in Time of divine Service ever was.

But let us go on to your third Promise, which is, that *if it bids you bow at the Name of Jesus, you will reverently submit.* This is indeed enjoined in the XVIIIth Canon, in these Words, “ And likewise when in Time of divine Service
“ the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and
“ lowly Reverence shall be done by all Persons
“ present, as it hath been accustomed; testify-
“ ing by these outward Ceremonies and Ges-
“ tures, their inward Humility, Christian Re-
“ solution, and due Acknowledgement, that
“ the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son
“ of God, is the only Saviour of the World, in
“ whom alone all the Mercies, Graces and Pro-
“ mises of God to Mankind, for this Life and
“ the Life to come, are fully and wholly com-
“ prised.” In speaking against this Gesture, in your second Letter, (a) you say, *As for that Passage of the Apostle Philip. ii. 10. that at the Name of Jesus every Knee shall bow — the learned Men of our Church, you presume universally disclaim it, as in the least authorising or injoining this Practice.* Upon which you argue. *But if this Text be acknowledged not in the least to authorise or require this Act of Worship, What Shadow of Argument,*

ment can possibly be brought either from Reason or Scripture, as shall so much as seem to support it? Why, since you do not seem to know, I will tell you by what Argument it is supported, by the very same that, in your Churches, sprinkling in Baptism and sitting in receiving the Holy Communion are enjoined (a), even by the Authority of the Church. For if neither sprinkling in Baptism, nor sitting at receiving the Holy Communion are expressly appointed in the Holy Scripture, as I am sure they are not, I would ask you, What *Shadow of Argument* can you possibly bring in Support of either, but from that Authority, which you must allow to be in your Churches to enjoin them? Admitting, then, that that Place of *Philippians*, before referred to, may be disclaimed by some, as not authorising or injoining the Practice of bowing at the Name of Jesus, though there might be possibly Reasons given why it ought not to be so readily disclaimed, yet, granting that it does not really support it, unless it could be proved to be an unlawful or unseemly Practice, our Church, for the Reasons assigned in the XVIIIth Canon, had as much a Right to enjoin the Observance of it, as your's had to require sitting at receiving the Lord's Supper, *as betokening Rest, and full Accomplishment of legal Ceremonies in our Saviour Christ.*

There is only one Particular more of all that you have promised which I shall take Notice of at present; reserving what I have to say to the rest, till I come to those several Sections you have separately bestowed upon them. What I mean is, your saying, that *if it requires you to believe*

(a) See Archbishop *Laud's* Introduction to the Liturgy, published by Dr. *Nicholls* at the End of his Comment upon the Common Prayer.

lieve, that an amorous Devil was forced away from his beloved Maid, by the Fumes of a Fish's Liver, you will roundly believe it. But, pray, Sir, Where does the Church of *England* require you, or any one else, to believe it? And what justifiable Reason had you for entertaining the least Suspicion that it was ever likely to do it? In the Church of Rome, by the Council of *Trent*, the Book of *Tobit* is put upon equal Authority with the rest of the holy Scripture, which has been held to be truly canonical; and consequently the Members of that Church must believe that Story. But, if by a Cast of your Art, you designed to mislead your Readers, and make them suspect that the same was done by the Church of *England*, or that it had any Disposition to do it, it was really very injurious and unwarrantable. For in the VIth Article, speaking of those Apocryphal Books appointed to be read sometimes in our Service, it says, "And as for the other Books, (as *Hierome* saith) the Church doth read for Example of Life, and Instruction of Manners; but, yet, doth it not apply them to establish any Doctrine." It from hence, I think, plainly appears, that our Church did not then put those Books upon the same Authority with the rest of the sacred Writings; and consequently, that it did not require every Circumstance of them to be believed; for which Reason, there could be no Ground for your suggesting that it was ever likely to do so. The Characters of *Tobit* and his Son, throughout that Book, from whence you have taken your Story, are such, that possibly our Saviour himself, had they lived in his Time, would have pronounced them *not far from the*
King-

Kingdom of God. And if so, the Church of *England* is justified for ordering the History of such Men to be read, *for the Example of Life, and Instruction of Manners*, as *St. Paul* recommended the Faith and Constancy of those who suffered in the Persecution of *Antiochus* (a), as Patterns to the *Hebrew* Christians; the Account of which we have in the Apocryphical Book, 2 *Maccab.* Chap. xvii.

Having now taken Notice of every Thing that appeared to me worthy of Consideration in your first Section; I shall pass over the second to the third, which has for its Title, *Of our Constitution in Church and State*, as more properly following the first, *Of Church Power, and in whom lodged*, than the second, *Of the Sacramental Test*. In the Beginning of this Section, you tell *Mr. White*, that you had in your first Letter (to which he had not presumed to make the least Reply) as also in the Beginning of this, fully proved our ecclesiastical to be really no other than a civil Constitution; a System or Frame contrived, disposed and enacted by the civil Magistrate, as much as the Constitution of the Treasury, of the Army, or of the Courts in Westminster Hall.

In Opposition to what you call your having proved, in the first Section of your third Letter, that the present Church of *England* was constituted, formed and established by the civil Magistrate, and only by him, I have already, in my Remarks upon it, made it, I hope, appear from very good Authority to be contrary to Matter
of

(a) *Heb.* xi. 35. In which Place *Beza* makes no doubt, but that the Apostle alludes to the Persecution of *Antiochus*. Non dubium est quin eam designat Persecutionem quam *Antiochus* exercuit.

of Fact; and that, so far were the civil Magistrates from constituting or framing this Church by their sole Authority, nothing was done by them in it, till it had been first regularly assented to by the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, both in the Reign of King *Edward* the Sixth, and also of Queen *Elizabeth*; and more especially in the Re-establishment of the present Church, after the Restoration of King *Charles* the Second. And now I shall proceed to examine what you have alledged for the same Purpose in your first Letter, which you imagine to have appeared so formidable to Mr. *White*, that he would not presume to make the least Reply to it.

Upon Mr. *White*'s having called the *Catholic Church one outward and visible Society divinely instituted*, you immediately close with him, and argue thus. *If it be a Society divinely instituted, then whatever Society is not of divine, but merely human Institution, is not the Church of Christ.* Be it so. But then, what is this to the Church of *England*, which you manifestly glance at in this Place? Since that, I hope, appears from what has been said before, upon very good Authority, not to be that merely *human Institution* you would have it thought to be.

But did you consider, that this Argument which you would look upon to be so strong and conclusive against the Church of *England*'s being a Christian Church, does really conclude more forceably against your Churches being Christian Churches, than it does against ours. For what are the Terms of Admission and Qualification of Members that are divinely fixed in the holy Scriptures? They are only these, Faith, Re-
pen-

pentance, and Baptism. And that none are admitted into the Church without these, I need only appeal to our Offices of publick Baptism, and our Catechism.

All then that you can ground your Insinuation upon, that the Terms of Admission into our Church are not divinely fixt, must be, that in the Administration of Baptism with us, some Things are appointed to be used, which are not precisely directed in the holy Scriptures. This is owned to be true. And have you nothing in the Administration of this Sacrament, but what is expressly enjoined in Scripture? I shall shew you that you have.

In the Form of Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, published by the *English* Brethren from *Geneva*, in the Office for Baptism we find this Order : “ For as much as the Sacraments are not to be ministered by Women, or used in private Corners, as Charms or Sorceries, but left to the Congregation, therefore the Infant that is to be baptized shall be brought to Church on the Day appointed to common Prayer or Preaching, accompanied with the Father or Godfather.” After Sermon, the Child is to be presented to the Minister, who is to demand this Question, Whether they earnestly desire that it may be ingrafted in the mystical Body of Jesus Christ? And, upon their answering in the Affirmative, he is to proceed to lay before them the Conditions of the baptismal Covenant. And to the Intent that they may be assured, that the Father and the Surety consent to the Performance thereof, it is ordered that the Father, or, in his Absence, the Godfather, shall rehearse the Creed. Then after
some

some Prayers and Exhortations he is to baptize the Child, taking Water in his Hand, and laying it upon the Forehead of the Child (a). Here are many Circumstances, no more *divinely fixt* than those which are used by us. And yet they are authoritatively enjoined; and must be regularly submitted to, before a Person can be admitted by Baptism into your Churches: For it is ordered, that the Child *shall* be brought to Church; that the Father or Godfather *shall* rehearse the Creed, before the Minister is to baptize the Child by taking Water in his Hand and laying it upon its Forehead; though this be not agreeable to the original Word of the Institution, which does properly imply dipping, for which there does not appear to be any Provision made in your Churches, if we are to judge of their Practice by the forecited Order. Whereas, in the Church of *England*, though sprinkling be indeed allowed, and commonly made Use of, yet it is ordered, that *if the Godfathers or Godmothers shall certify the Minister, that the Child may well endure it, he shall dip it discreetly and warily* (b). And if this be insisted upon, no Minister of the Church of *England* can legally refuse it. But your Churches requiring Asperision only, the Terms of Admission into them are certainly less divinely fixt, being in this particular less conformable to the scriptural Word of the Institution, than those of the Church of *England* are. If you say, that if Dipping should be required your Ministers would not refuse it. I answer, that how readily soever

D

they

(a) See *Laud's Introduction*, p. 14. at the End of Dr. *Nicholl's Paraphrase*.
 (b) See Rubrick in the Office of Publick Baptism.

they may in themselves be disposed to such Indulgence, yet, as it does not appear to be provided for, I cannot help doubting whether they are vested with such a dispensing Power, as to vary from the standing Rules and Orders of their Churches, at their own Discretion, without, if they are Presbyterian, the Allowance of their general Assemblies, or at least their classical Presbyteries; or, if they are congregational or independent, without the Consent and Concurrence of the ruling Elders of their respective Congregations. If then the making Use of some Circumstances in the Administration of Baptism, whereby Persons are admitted into the Church, which are not precisely appointed in the holy Scripture, be sufficient to prove any Church not to be Christian, your own, from what has been said above, must necessarily be excluded. But let us now examine the several Particulars of that Comparison you have drawn between the Church of Christ and the Church of *England*, in order to prove them to be *Constitutions of a quite different Nature*.

You tell us, in the first Place, *that the Constitution and Frame of the Church of England must be looked for in the Statute Book, in the Canons and Common Prayer Book, and in the Codes of the English Law. But the Church of Christ is to be looked for only in the Bible.* And therein too only, is the Church of *England* to be found as to the Fundamentals of it, notwithstanding what you have said to the contrary. For what have you advanced to prove that the Church of *England*, as to its Constitution and Frame, is not to be found in the Bible? It is, if I mistake not, only because that in it some Rites and Ceremonies

Ceremonies are enjoined which are not expressly required by the holy Scripture ; though in in-joining of these, it has exercised no greater Authority than what has been ever used by other, nay even by your own, Churches. But then, as the Constitution and Frame of a Church depends no more upon these external Rites and Ceremonies, than the Frame and Building of a House upon its outward Ornaments, your Conclusion, that, because of these, the Church of *England*, as to its Constitution and Frame, is not to be looked for in the Bible, seems to have out-run its Premises.

In your next Comparison you tell us again, that “ the Church of Christ is a religious Establishment, founded upon the Scripture, as “ the only authentic Rule of its Doctrines and “ Worship ; the Church of *England* is a Civil “ Establishment, founded upon Acts of Parliament, as the only authentic Rule of what “ is to be believed and practised therein, &c.” In this Comparison, besides repeating in other Words what you had said in the foregoing one, you have moreover glanced at the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. It is really somewhat surprising to hear you reflecting upon the Doctrine of our Church at every Turn, when your own Churches, in respect of that, stand yet upon the very same Foundation. For were not your Churches at first tolerated merely upon account of their professing the same Doctrine with ours ? Are not your Ministers obliged, by the Act of Toleration, to subscribe to all our Articles, except the 34, 35, 36, and these Words of the 20th, “ The Church hath Power to “ decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in

“Controversies of Faith,” before they can legally preach or officiate in any of your Meetings? Now, those remaining Articles, unexcepted against, and which ought legally to be subscribed to by every one of your Ministers, contain the Doctrine of our Church : And consequently the Doctrine of those Articles is, or ought to be, the Doctrine of your Churches, as much as it is of ours. And for that Reason, upon the Act of Toleration (though you would not seem to know it) are your Churches as much founded, *as the only authentic Rule* of what is at least to be believed by them, as ours is upon any Act or *Acts of* Parliament you can possibly produce. And if the Bible, which you quote *Chillingworth* as calling the only Religion of Protestants, be not the Foundation of the Doctrine of our Church, it cannot be that of yours ; upon which Account your Churches would be as far from being *spiritual Structures*, but would be as merely political, as you would have ours thought to be. But as for that Concern the civil Rulers had in the Establishment of this Church, wherewith you have reproached us in this and the foregoing Comparison, they did no more than what was their Right to do : No more than what was highly necessary and expedient, for the Welfare and well-governing of the Church, for them to do : That, by the help of their Sanction, Unity of Doctrine, and Uniformity of Worship, might be maintained and preserved amongst one and the same People : That they might be kept from running into that Confusion, the Church of *Corinth* actually fell into, even in the Apostles Days, when they came together to worship, of *having every one*
a Psalm,

a Psalm, a Doctrine, a Tongue, a Revelation, an Interpretation (a). But to go on. In the next Place, you say, that *into the Church of Christ any Person may be admitted, who submits to the Terms appointed by Christ : But into the Church of England, he cannot be admitted, except over and above these, he submits also to Terms which human Authority hath instituted and devised.* If this be any reasonable Objection against the Church of *England*, I say again, it must be so likewise against your own. For I have already made it appear, that who ever will be admitted into your Churches, must, over and above the Terms appointed by Jesus Christ, submit also to Terms of human Invention, such as being baptized in the Face of the Congregation, and that by sprinkling only; in which Respect, they are more unscriptural than the Church of *England*, which has also provided for dipping, more agreeable to the scriptural Word of the Institution. As to what you say *of the Lord's Supper, being appointed in the Church of England, with Intention and as a Mean of discriminating and dividing Christians ; and that an openly debauched and scandalous wicked Person has a Right to demand the holy Sacrament at the Priest's Hands as a Qualification for his Post ;* I shall prove to be both groundless and unreasonable, when I come to speak to your Section of the sacramental Test.

Your next Observation is, that in the scriptural Church of Christ, there are no such Officers ever heard of as Archbishops, Deans, Archdeacons, Prebendaries, Canons, Chancellors, &c. And I say, moreover, that neither classi-

D 3

cal,

cal, nor provincial, or national, Assemblies, with their Moderators and Assessors, are ever heard of there (*a*). And I might add, nor even your ruling Elders, who yet make so essential a Part of your ecclesiastical Constitution. Now these classical Presbyteries have not only the Power to ordain the Ministers of such Congregations as are respectively under them, and upon that Account exercise the episcopal Authority ; but they have also a Right to take Cognizance of, and to correct, what is done irregularly in the congregational or parochial Elderships (*b*) ; and consequently exercise the very same Power, which is delegated by the Bishops to their Archdeacons. Again, the provincial or national Assembly takes Cognizance of what is done in the classical Presbyteries (*c*), and therefore acts with an Authority equal to that of our Archbishops. And if the Moderators and Assessors are for the same Purpose to these Assemblies, that Chancellors are to the Bishops, then have some dissenting Churches, at least, the same Offices as those of Archbishops, Archdeacons and Chancellors, though exercised by Persons under different Denominations. And if the Scripture affords any Reason to believe, that there were such Offices as those of Deans, Prebends, and Canons, in the Ministry of the Church, even in the Apostles Days, then will it be a sufficient Justification for the continuing such in it at present. Now we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, and some of St. Paul's Epistles, that
it

(*a*) Vindic. of Presb. Govern. &c. at the End.

(*b*) *Ibid.* p. 3.

(*c*) *Laud's* Introd. in Dr. *Nicholl's* Paraph. and *Heylin's* History of the Presbyterians, Lib. 5. Sect. 35.

it was customary for the Apostles to ordain Pastors in those Churches which had been converted by them ; who had not only the Feeding, but the Oversight of the Flocks in their Absence ; yet acting in the Discharge of this Trust under their Direction. Such Pastors we find from Acts xx. 17, 28. to have been in the Church of *Ephesus*. And St. Paul directs his Epistle to the *Philippians*, to the Saints in Christ Jesus, which are at *Philippi*, with the Bishops and Deacons. These Bishops I shall have Occasion to prove, not to have been of equal Rank or Authority with those who are called Bishops at present ; but to have been only Presbyters, or Priests of the second Order in the Ministry ; and consequently, the Prebends and Canons in our capitular Churches, may not improperly be supposed to owe their Institution and Continuance from hence. Over these again, there was a President, not of a superior but equal Rank with themselves ; who had this Preheminence, only for the more regular Dispatch of their Business (a). Like unto whom is a Dean in our Chapters. And notwithstanding, in after Times, such President, from the precise Number the Clergy of his Church may have been limited to, has been distinguished by the Name of *Decanus* or Dean, and the Clergy composing the Chapters, from the different Manner in which their Subsistence was allowed them, have been called either Prebends or Canons (b), the Change of the Name ought to be looked upon as of no great Import, if the Institutions are the same. But to proceed,

D 4

As

(a) Vid. Bezam. 1 Tim. v. 22. (b) See Dr. Nicholl's Annot upon the Act of Uniformity of King Charles II.

As to that Text of St. Paul, *What have I to do with them that are without (a)*? Whereby you would prove the Church of *England* to act contrary to the Church of Christ, in extending its Authority over those who never belonged to it; Mr. *White* has shewed it to be nothing to your Purpose; because it does not relate to Christians under a Jurisdiction distinct from that of St. Paul; but to those who were no Christians at all, to Heathens unconverted. And he has moreover observed, that there is nothing more marvellous in the Church of *England's* excommunicating such as were *de Jure* Members of it, though they would not be so *de Façto*, than in the States passing a Sentence of Outlawry against such offending Members, as had fled from it without any visible Intent of ever returning to it again.

In the next Place, you say, *that the Rod with which the Church of Christ chastises its Delinquents, is spiritual, and not carnal; but the Rod of the Church of England, is carnal, and not spiritual.* But how is this proved? Why, because *the excommunicated Member is delivered over to the Civil Arm, to humble and chastise him.* However, if this be a Fault, it is a Fault not peculiar to the Church of *England*. For in the Church of *Geneva*, as constituted by Calvin himself, we find it ordered, that *if a Man stood excommunicate, or in Contempt against the Censures of the Church for the Space of a Twelve-month, he was to suffer a whole Year's Banishment by the Decree of the Senate (b)*, which was, I think,

(a) 1 Cor. v. 12.
Lib. 1. Sect. 2. and Unreasonableness of Seper. Lib. 3. Sect. 32.

(b) Heylin's Hist. of Presb.

I think, the Civil Arm of that State. In *Calvin's* Opinion, therefore, we see it was allowable to *deliver over to the Civil Arm, to humble and chastise them* who stood excommunicate, or in Contempt against the Censures of the Church. But if the Church of *England* does *deliver over to the Civil Arm* (as you have chose invidiously to express it) *the excommunicated Member to be humbled and chastised*, it is a plain Confession that it does not look upon itself, as having any Power to *meddle with him as to his Civil Properties and Rights*, any more than the Church of Christ originally did. The Rod of the spiritual Rulers of this Church, as it ought to be of those of all other Churches, is merely spiritual, and can affect Persons only in their spiritual Capacities. But if any temporal Inconvenience follows the spiritual Awards of the Church, it is, it must be, only from the Authority of the Civil Powers; who may certainly, if they please, enact, that those Persons shall be deprived also of the Privilege and Protection of their State, who have rendered themselves unworthy to be continued Members of a Christian Society. God long ago promised that Civil Rulers should be *nursing Fathers and nursing Mothers* of his Church. And as such, it is their Duty to endeavour, by the Aid and Interposition of their Authority, to keep it in Purity and Peace. In Purity, against the open or secret Designs of the Heretical; In Peace, against all Attempts of the Refractory and Contumacious, the Gainsaying and Disobedient.

To what you have objected, concerning Commutation of Penance, Mr. *White* has observed, that allowing it not to be strictly and ecclesiastically right; yet a pecuniary Penalty may be such as the present State of Things would best admit

admit of. That it was, however, a Penalty; which was better than none at all, and letting Offenders escape, as may be commonly done among you, without Penance or Commutation either (a).

To your next Objection, which had been made before by Mr. *Pierce*, viz. that *some of the most sacred Acts of spiritual Jurisdiction, its solemn Censures and Excommunications, are exercised in the Church of England by unconsecrated and mere Laymen*, Mr. *White* has also replied, That Lay-Chancellors act by an Authority derived from their Bishops, and in Matters of Excommunication only declare, as Civilians, what is Law, the Sentence being pronounced, as well in Court as at Church, by ecclesiastical Persons; and consequently they are not so irregular, as Laymen being permitted, in your Churches, to occupy the Place of Pastors in settled Congregations, sometimes for Years together, before their pretended Ordination. Nay, much less so, than your Lay-Elders, who, though pretty much upon a Footing as to Scripture Warrant and Authority, yet exercise the Power of the Keys in another guise sort of Manner than is done by our Lay-Chancellors: For they sit and have equal Vote with the Pastors, in all Business, both in making of new Laws, and in executing the old: Jointly with them, they suspend from the Lord's Table, they excommunicate; and they do it too by a Power which is supposed inherent and properly their own (b). Were then the admitting Laymen to exercise any spiritual Authority sufficient to render

(a) Mr. *White's* 3 Lett. p. 232.
and 2 Def. p. 96, 97.

(b) *Ibid.* p. 229.

render any Church unlike to the Church of Christ, your own, wherein it is fundamentally allowed to Laymen to execute the highest Instances of it, can certainly bear no Sort of Resemblance to it.

The next Comparison you make, between the Church of Christ and the Church of *England*, is, that *the Church of England props itself on every Side with Civil Dignities and Emoluments, intrenches itself deep under Shelter of penal Laws, &c. Whereas the Church of Christ never owed its Support (it scorned to owe its Propagation and Support) to the Powers, Preferments, and Riches of the World.* That the Church of Christ did not owe its Propagation (which by the Bye you have pressed into your Service here, though quite foreign to the Argument in Hand) to the Assistance or Support of the Civil Powers, is very true. And it is a very strong Evidence of the internal Excellence of the Christian Religion (and it was undoubtedly designed as such) that it was able to prevail in the World, not only without the Countenance of the Powers of the World, but even against the most violent Discouragement they could lay in its Way. For, for the first three Centuries, the Church met with no Civil Magistrate, who took any Notice of it, unless it were to oppress and persecute it. But when it had made its Way, notwithstanding, in great Measure throughout the World, it does not seem then to have *scorned the Support* and Favour of the Civil Rulers, when it was so happy as to get them on its Side. For when, in the Beginning of the fourth Century, *Constantine* the Roman Emperor became Christian, it very readily put itself under the
Shelter

Shelter of his Authority, and thankfully received whatever Favours he was pleased to confer. And so far did he then Interest himself in the Affairs of the Church, without its ever being reproached, so far as appears, for submitting to it, that he called himself the Bishop of those Things which concerned the external Polity of it (a). And it appears from the Life of that Emperor, and the Transactions of the Church during his Reign, that it did then as deeply intrench itself under the Shelter of his Edicts, as the Church of *England* does now under the Authority of the Civil Powers of this Nation. And as to Civil Dignities and Emoluments, there were some very considerable, confirmed to the Bishops and Clergy by that Emperor; such as the Liberty for Persons to appeal to the Judgment of the Bishops, even in Civil Causes, though the Process had been begun before another Judge. And the Exemption of the Clergy, from serving any publick Offices of the State (b). But that Distinction which *Constantine* made, in calling himself Bishop of those Things which concerned the external Polity of the Church, and his executing that Authority being freely submitted to by the Bishops of those Times, without any Kind of Remonstrance against it, as an undue or unscriptural Usurpation, do plainly shew that it was the Opinion of the spiritual Rulers of the Church, if not from the Beginning, yet at least then, that the temporal Government of it does belong to the Christian Sovereigns of all States, whenever

(a) *Ensebius* in the Life of *Constantine*. [b] See the Life of the same Emperor, in *Du Pin's Nouvelle Bibliotheq.*

whenever they please to take it upon them : And moreover, afford an easy and proper Solution to that Difficulty, which in the last Place you think so great, that the Person who should solve it, would, in your Opinion, merit the highest Dignity in the Church, *viz.* how to reconcile our *King or Queen* being supreme Head of this Church, with that sovereign Authority Christ hath over the Whole. You have throwed together several Texts of Scripture to prove, that Jesus Christ is the only supreme Head of his Church ; and I might, with as much Propriety, select several others which declare God to be sovereign Ruler over all the World ; and very gravely ask you, How the calling our Kings or Queens in all Causes Civil Supreme, can be consistent with that sovereign Power which God hath over all ? and very quaintly tell you, that you would deserve to be made Prime Minister, if you could but do it. I suppose you would Answer (for I do not know what else you would) that, though with Respect to their People, and all foreign Potentates, they were thus Supreme; yet with Respect to God, they were still Subordinate, and were only his Ministers. In like Manner it may be said, that, though in Regard to the external Polity of this Church, and all foreign Prelates and Powers, they are in all Causes ecclesiastical Supreme ; yet with Regard to Christ they are still Subordinate ; and have, under him, only the Tutelage and Protection of that Part of his Church which is in their Dominions. And notwithstanding our Kings or Queens are the supreme Heads of this Church, yet it is only so far as the external Polity of it is concerned ; for they really exercise no greater Authority

Authority over it, as it is co-extended with their Dominions, than *Constantine* did over the Christian, so far as it was then co-extended with his Empire.

You have alledged some Authorities to prove, that our Kings and Queens have really exercised a far greater, even a spiritual, Jurisdiction over this Church; the Validity of which I shall now examine. But before I proceed, I can but observe, that if the Church of *England* does owe its Support to the Powers of the World, and intranches itself deep under Shelter of penal Laws, your Churches do the very same. For you boastingly tell us, that *the very Authority, upon which alone our Church rests, bath allowed you to set up your separate Churches for Worship; and bath taken those Churches, and the Worship performed in them, under its immediate Protection and Care (a).* And if the Service of the Church of *England* is secured by penal Laws, that of yours is so likewise. For, by the Act of Toleration, a Penalty of twenty Pounds is laid upon any Person who shall be convicted of having disturbed you in the Performance of it. And if the Clergy of the Church of *England* are exempted from serving publick Offices by the Act of Toleration, so are your Ministers. Now if it be justifiable *for your Churches* to put themselves thus under the immediate Protection and Care of the Civil Authority, and *under the Shelter* of penal Laws, How can you consistently reproach our Church, for having done the same? But as for any other penal Laws, which concern it in other Respects, (if any such there are) you have, I think, made it plainly appear, that

(a) Diff. Gent. 3 Lett. p. 2.

that they are neither very terrible nor effectual. Since you have convinced the World, that a Person may take the Liberty notwithstanding to call it, *with Impunity, and that too in the most publick Manner*, a Constitution of a quite different Nature from the Church of Christ (a), that is, in other Words, no Christian Church at all. But to return to the Examination of the Validity of those Authorities you have produced, in order to prove, that our Kings and Queens have a Power to exercise even a spiritual Jurisdiction over this Church. The first that you give us is, from two Acts of Parliament made in the Reign of *Henry VIII.* from whence you have made the following Extract, viz. that the King or Queen is supreme Head, “ vested with all Power to exercise all Manner
 “ of ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; and Archbishops,
 “ Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical
 “ Persons, have no Manner of Jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by and under the King’s
 “ Majesty, who hath full Power and Authority
 “ to hear and determine all Manner of Causes
 “ ecclesiastical, and to reform and correct all
 “ Vice, Sin, Heresies, Enormities, Abuses
 “ whatever, which, by any Manner of spiritual
 “ Authority or Jurisdiction, ought or may
 “ lawfully be reformed.” Now it plainly appears, from the very seventeenth Act of the 37th of *Henry VIII.* from whence you have in great Measure made your Extract, that all this was peculiarly levelled against the Usurpations of the Bishops of *Rome*, and regards not the spiritual, but temporal Government only of the Church, which they had unjustifiably taken upon

(a) Dissent. Gent. 1 Lett. Title Page.

upon them to execute, independent of the Civil Power, and that too, to a Degree greatly detrimental, not only to the Prerogative of the Crown, but also to the Civil Rights of the People. No more therefore is given to the Civil Power in these Acts, than what properly belonged to it. For the spiritual Part of the Church having no temporal Authority over the Persons, the Liberties, or Property of its Members, several gross Enormities might be committed, for the preventing of which it could apply no effectual Remedy. Several might fall into very pernicious Heresies. What are the spiritual Rulers to do in such Cases? It may be said, they have the Power of Excommunication in them: Very true, But what will this avail with those who have excommunicated themselves already; and consequently despise all the Terrors of it; and might, notwithstanding, not only continue in their Errors themselves, but also endeavour to propagate them, by drawing others into them. Again, others may live in open and scandalous Immoralities; the spiritual Rulers and Pastors have, indeed, the Power to remonstrate and rebuke them for them, and upon continued Incurability, may excommunicate. But, alas! What Effect would this have with determined and abandoned Sinners, who are not to be wrought upon by the Glories, nor awed by the Terrors, of a future State? Here then it is the Civil Magistrate only, who, by his Authority, can give a Check to such Licentiousness, either in Opinion or Practice, by super-adding such temporal Penalties, ever most effectual with such Men, as shall seem most meet for that Purpose. So that they who wear this Crown,

Crown, and who have the executive Authority of all the Laws, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, vested in them, may very properly be said to have full Power and Authority, to do from Time to Time all that is mentioned in your Extract, without any Diminution of, or Encroachment upon, the spiritual Power of this Church.

The next Proof you produce of our King's having exercised a spiritual Authority over this Church, is, because our first reformed Bishops took out Licence to ordain; from whence you would have it inferred, that they received their very spiritual Power to ordain, from the Civil Magistrate (a). That there were such Licences granted is very true; but that no spiritual Power was designed to be conveyed to them thereby, but rather that temporal Jurisdiction over their respective Dioceses, which properly belonged to the King, is manifest: In the first Place, from the several Provisions made concerning the Ordination of Bishops; for in the twentieth Act of the twenty-fifth Year of *Henry VIII.* there is recital made of a foregoing Statute, whereby it had been ordained, that *if any Person, presented by the King to the See of Rome, for a Bishoprick in England, be there delayed, he may be consecrated by an Archbishop in England: Again, if one presented to the See of Rome for an Archbishoprick in England, be there letted, he may be consecrated by two Bishops in England:* But it is enacted in this, that when any Bishop had been duely elected to any Bishoprick, and made the usual Oath and Fealty to the King, that then the King, " By his Letters Patents under his " great Seal, shall signify the said Election to
E " the

(a) 1 Lett. p. 30.

“ the Archbishop and Metropolitane of the
 “ Province, where the See of the said Bishoprick
 “ was void, if the See of the said Archbishop
 “ be full and not void, and if it be void, then
 “ to any other Archbishop within this Realm,
 “ or in any other the King’s Dominions, re-
 “ quiring and commanding such Archbishop,
 “ to whom any such Signification shall be made,
 “ to confirm the said Election, and invest and
 “ consecrate the said Person so elected, to the
 “ Office and Dignity he is elected unto, and
 “ to give and Use to him all such Benedictions,
 “ Ceremonies, and other Things requisite to
 “ the same :” Also, when an Archbishop had
 been duely elected to an Archbishoprick, after
 the usual Oath and Fealty made, then the King
 in Manner and Form aforesaid, was to signify
 the said Election “ To one Archbishop and two
 “ Bishops, or else to four Bishops within this
 “ Realm, or any other the King’s Dominions,
 “ &c. commanding them with all Speed and
 “ Celerity to confirm the said Election, and to
 “ invest and consecrate the said Person so elec-
 “ ted, to the Office and Dignity he is elected
 “ unto, and to give and use to him such Pall,
 “ Benedictions, Ceremonies, and all other
 “ Things requisite for the same.” Now, if
 King *Henry VIII.* had ever imagined, that he
 had, in himself, the Power to ordain, or thought
 he could by Commission delegate it to others,
 How came he to apply to the Bishops of *Rome*,
 for the Ordination of his Bishops ; Or, how came
 he to issue out his Letters Patent to Arch-
 bishops and Bishops, to *invest and consecrate*
others, and to give and use to them all Benedic-
tions, Ceremonies, and other Things requisite for
the

the same? Why did he not, *Jeroboam* like, at once consecrate, by his own Authority, whomsoever he would to such Offices? But as this, it seems, was what he never once attempted, it carries a plain Confession with it, that he did not believe any such Power to belong to him, and, consequently, that he could never have designed to convey it to others by his Commission. But if,

In the next Place, he is supposed to have claimed this Authority only in the Ordination of the Ministers of inferior Orders; I then say it is very extraordinary, that we do not meet with so much as one single Instance of any Person's being admitted to a Benefice with Cure of Souls without episcopal, but merely upon the King's, or his Vicegerent *Cromwell's*, Ordination; though you have so peremptorily asserted, that this very Power of Ordination was once delegated to him; "and that by the Constitution and Law of *England* (but by what particular Part of it you have not been pleased to point out) this Layman had then as much Authority to ordain as any Bishop in the Realm; and that any Priest whom he had ordained, would have been as much a Minister in the Church of *England*, and his Ministration as valid, as if all the Bishops of the Realm had laid their Hands upon him (a)." But probably this Authority delegated to Lord *Cromwell*, which you have here made so much of, candidly considered, would be found never to have been intended to authorise him to ordain, but only to overlook the Bishops, in the Business of Ordination, whose Attachment to

E 2

the

(a) Dissent. Gent. 3 Lett. p. 62.

the Pope's Supremacy might then have been suspected. *Rapin* acquaints us, that *Henry* the VIIIth was so jealous of his Supremacy, that he neglected nothing to support it (*b*). And undoubtedly one effectual Method to support it, was, to take especial Care that none might be admitted to any holy Function in the Church, but such as, upon due Examination, were found sincerely to acknowledge it. Lord *Cromwell* therefore, whom he had made his Vicegerent, or Vice-General, in ecclesiastical Matters, was to see that this was punctually observed. But his other Engagements preventing him from giving his personal Attendance so often as it was necessary, the Bishops did represent it to the King, requesting that this Business might be intrusted to them, that they might not be delayed in ordaining Persons to the Ministry, by waiting for the Leisure of those, whose other Employments would not permit them to attend upon it. Upon which, Commissions for this Purpose were granted to such Bishops as the King might think most firmly attached to his supremacy. And what confirms this to be really the Truth of the Case, is, because we hear, I think, no more of those Commissions, when the reformed Liturgy was established, and the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy inserted in the Offices of Ordination, to be administered to all those who came for holy Orders, before they were admitted to them. But to argue, that those Bishops received from those Commissions their spiritual Authority to ordain is very extraordinary: Because those Bishops, as Bishops, had this Authority, even from the very Foundation

(*b*) Vol. 1. p. 824. Col. 2.

dation of the Church, before ever those Commissions were granted; whereby they were only permitted to exercise it, free from those impediments, which, for Reasons of State, they were subject to before.

In the next Place you infer from their Supremacy, that “ the King or Queen of this Church
 “ (as you are pleased to express yourself) hath
 “ Power to excommunicate from, or to read-
 “ mit into it, independent of, yea, in direct
 “ Opposition to, all its Bishops and Clergy.
 “ The King or Queen revoke, if they please,
 “ any spiritual Censures of the Bishops or Arch-
 “ bishops; yea, can suspend, deprive, or even
 “ excommunicate themselves; or can, by their
 “ Proclamation only, without the least Con-
 “ fession, Humiliation, or Satisfaction for their
 “ Offence, pardon and restore excommunicated
 “ Persons, the vilest Offenders, to the Churches
 “ Bosom again.” The only Authority you
 have given, in Support of all these several As-
 sertions, is that of *a Parson, who was deprived for
 Adultery; afterwards a general Pardon came, which
 pardoned the Adultery; it was adjudgd, that the
 Parson was, ipso Facto, restored to his Benefice (a).*
 But, let your Authorities be what they will,
 you are mistaken in that Inference, you would
 draw from thence, that the Kings or Queens
 of the Nation have too great a Share in the spi-
 ritual Authority of this Church. And this your
 Mistake proceeds, from your blending and con-
 founding those Things together, which are in
 their Natures most distinct and separate; I mean
 the Spiritual and Temporal Power in the Go-
 vernment thereof; the one belonging to the
 E 3 Rulers

(a) Dissent. Gent. 1 Lett. p. 31.

Rulers and Pastors which Christ has appointed, the other to the Rulers of the People. Now, by the Laws of this State, there are temporal Penalties annexed, in many Cases, to the Censures of the Church, which the Kings or Queens of this Realm, who are in all Causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil, supreme, can remit, if they please, in the same Manner they can pardon Offences against any other Laws of the State. But to infer from thence, that those Persons who have those temporal Penalties remitted to them, are, upon Account thereof, *restored to the Churches Bosom*, that is, are cleared from the spiritual Penalties they are subject to from the Censures of it, is just as proper as it would be to maintain, when the King pardons a Person convicted of Murder, or any other Crime, whereby he had offended against God, as well as against the State, that such Criminal, by that Act of the King, is restored to the Favour of God, and intitled to his Pardon.

To the same Fault, of blending and confounding those Things together which are in themselves most distinct and separate, is owing, also, that erroneous Notion you entertain, of what is to be understood by *our Constitution in Church and State*; that, *nothing else can be meant thereby, than that Order or Form of Government, respecting all Persons and Things, which is established by the Laws and Customs of this Realm* (a). For they are really two distinct States, to each of which the Word Constitution is to be separately applied. And it is no improper or unusual Way of speaking, when the same Word is applicable to different Members of the same Sentence,

(a) Diff. Gent. 3 Letter, p. 21.

Sentence, to use it but once, in order to avoid Prolixity or Tautology. The Constitution then, in State, implies that excellent and happy Form of Government, whereby we are governed in what regards our Civil Capacities; and the Constitution in Church, that truly Apostolical Church, established in this Nation, whereby we are governed guided and directed in our Spiritual. Over the Church, so far as the external or temporal Government of it is concerned, as well as over the State, the Kings or Queens of this Realm are supreme; and by the Laws and Customs of this Nation, they have the same Authority over the one as they have over the other. As the Parliament, which is composed of the Nobility and Representatives of the People, cannot meet without their Consent or Permission, and even, when assembled, they have a Power to put a Stop to the Proceeding thereof, by proroguing or dissolving at their Pleasure; so is it with regard to the Convocation, the Constituents whereof are the Bishops and Representatives of the Clergy: The Kings or Queens only have the Power to convene them, and, when assembled, if they are engaged upon Business they have Reason to disapprove of, if, upon signifying their Displeasure, they do not desist, they can dissolve them if they please. And in this consisted the whole Affair concerning Mr. *Whiston*, which you have made so much of. The Convocation, then sitting, was going to call him to account for some erroneous Opinions; the Queen apprehending that great Disturbance might ensue in the Civil State of Affairs, if this Business should be proceeded in to Extremity, required them to desist. They,

as they ought to do, obeyed, and so the Affair was dropt. If the Queen did no more upon this Occasion, what warrantable Grounds had you to assert, that by this Act she declared *what was Heresy or not Heresy?* When it does not appear, that she either directly or indirectly declared any Thing concerning it. All that can fairly be inferred from this whole Transaction is, that, for prudential Reasons, she did not Care to have this Matter proceeded in any farther, when the Minds of the People were but too much divided and embittered against each other by Party already (a).

(a) That this was all the Queen intended may be collected from Mr. *Whiston's* Memoirs, &c. of Dr. *Clark*, pages 30, 31, where he says, that before the Publication of Dr. *Clark's* Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, there was a Message sent him from Lord *Godolphin*, and some others of Queen *Anne's* Ministers, that the Affairs of the Publick were with Difficulty then kept "In the Hands of those that were for Liberty; that it was, therefore, an unreasonable Time for the Publication of a Book that would make a great Noise and Disturbance; and that, therefore, they desired him to forbear till a fitter Opportunity should offer itself." And he, moreover, lets us know, that a parallel Message had been sent himself a few Years earlier, from the same Lord *Godolphin*, in order to put a Stop to the Publication of his Account of the Primitive Faith, concerning the Trinity and Incarnation. But when neither of these Gentlemen could be prevailed upon not to publish their Notions; the Queen, thereupon, thus expressed herself to her Parliament, April 5, 1710, that "She could heartily wish, that Men would Study to be quiet and do their own Business, rather than busy themselves in reviving Questions and Disputes of a very high Nature, and which could only tend to foment, but not to heal, our Divisions and Animosities." Which Words he always took to concern himself, and to be a Reflection on his reviving what has been called Arianism.

N. B. The Convocation called upon Mr. *Whiston* in March 1711.

As

As to that Power the Kings of this Realm have, in other Particulars, exercised over the Affairs of this Church, it was no more than what was just and reasonable, being no greater than what the Kings of *Judah* exercised over the Church of the *Jews*. *David*, when he had removed the Ark to *Jerusalem*, made several new Dispositions in the Service of the Priests and Levites (a). The same did *Solomon* when he had dedicated his Temple (b). Nay *Solomon* thrust out *Abiathar* from being Priest unto the Lord, because he had followed *Adonijah*; and put *Zadock*, one of a collateral Line, in his Room (c). But notwithstanding the Kings of this Realm have a Power to depose Bishops from their Bishopricks, and to prohibit them from exercising their spiritual Functions in their Dominions; yet it does not follow from thence, that those Bishops are deprived of their spiritual Power. For if those Exceptions, for which they had been deposed, should at any Time be removed, they would then be at Liberty freely to exercise their spiritual Functions, without being ordained anew.

But to return to your Notion of our Constitution in Church and State, that *our Ecclesiastical is really no other than a Branch or Limb of the Civil Constitution* (d). And that *this is quite agreeable to the Sentiments of our first Reformers, the Founders and Framers of it*, you say, appears from the Determinations of a select Assembly of them, convened at *Windsor* by King *Edward VI.* by whom (as may be concluded from *Archbishop Cranmer's Manuscript*) it was declared, " That
all

(a) 1 Chron. xv. 16, 24, 25.

(b) 2 Chron. viii. 14.

(c) 1 Kings ii. 27, 35.

(d) Diff. Gent. 3 Lett. p. 20.

“ all Christian Princes have committed to them,
 “ immediately from God, the *whole* Cure of
 “ their Subjects, as well concerning the Ad-
 “ ministration of God’s Word for the *Cure of*
 “ *Soul*, as concerning Things of political and
 “ civil Governance. In both these Minистра-
 “ tions, they must have sundry Ministers under
 “ them, to supply that which is appointed to
 “ their several Office.

“ The Civil Ministers under the King’s Ma-
 “ jesty in this Realm, be those whom it shall
 “ please his Highness, for the Time, to put
 “ in Authority under him; as for Example,
 “ the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, Lord
 “ Admiral, &c.

“ The Ministers of God’s Word under his
 “ Majesty, be the Bishops, Parsons, Vicars,
 “ and such other Priests as be appointed by his
 “ Highness to that Ministration; as for Ex-
 “ ample, the Bishop of *Canterbury*, the Bishop
 “ of *Winchester*, the Parson of *Coynewick*, &c.

“ All the said Officers and Ministers, as well
 “ of the one Sort as of the other, be appointed,
 “ assigned and elected in every Place, by the
 “ Laws and Orders of Kings and Princes.”

Now, so far is it from appearing, from this
 Extract, *quite agreeable to the Sentiments of our*
first Reformers, the Founders and Framers of our
ecclesiastical Constitution, that it was no other
 than a *Branch or Limb of the Civil*, that I
 cannot help thinking, an indifferent Person
 might have read it over very frequently, with-
 out so much as once conceiving that they had
 any such Opinion concerning it. For, whereas
 it is said, in the first Article of the Extract, *in*
both these Ministrations; and also, in the last, *as*
well

well of the one Sort as of the other ; two different Ministrations are plainly implied ; the Ministration in the Church as one, the Ministration in the State as the other ; without any Thing so intimately to connect them, as might reasonably induce any one to believe, that they thought the one to depend upon the other for its very Essence and Frame. But if, by putting the Word whole, and the Cure of Soul in Italicks, you would insinuate that they, in saying that Christian Princes have committed to them by God the whole Cure of their Subjects concerning the Administration of God's Word for the Cure of Soul, intend to be understood, as if they thought that the spiritual Authority of our Ministers was derived from the King ; it is an injurious Insinuation, being contrary to what appears to have been their Intention, throughout this whole Extract ; which is explained, in the last Article of it but one ; where they speak of Bishops, Parsons, Vicars, Persons already duely ordained, and who, as such, were only to be appointed by the King, according to the Laws and Orders of Kings and Princes, to the several Places, wherein they were to exercise their respective spiritual Functions ; as the Priests and Levites, who had before received their Orders from God, were yet settled in their Courses, by David and Solomon, both under the Tabernacle and under the Temple. In the next Place, in Order to prove that our supreme civil Magistrates have actually exercised a Power even in the spiritual Business of the Church, you tell us, that Queen Elizabeth composed a Prayer for the Use of a great Number of her Nobility and Gentry, as well as her common Soldiers and Sailors, in the Expedition

Expedition against Cadiz, directing it to be used daily in every Ship (a). From whence you take upon you boldly, and, I might add, somewhat unbecomingly, to *presume*, that, by *Virtue of her Supremacy*, she might, if she had pleased (and that any future Queen may) compose Prayers for the Use of the Archbishops, Bishops, and all the Clergy of the Land; and injoin their solemn Use every Sunday in the Church; and that the Use of such devout Feminine Compositions, no Bishop nor Priests can, agreeable to our Constitution, in any wise refuse (b). But surely, Sir, you could never be serious in pretending to *presume* all this; for I cannot easily persuade myself, that you are so very ignorant of the Nature of our Constitution, as not to know, that neither a King nor Queen of this Realm, by being in all Causes ecclesiastical supreme, can make a new Ordinance, or change an old one in this Church, by their own Will and Authority, and oblige either Ministers or People to obey it; any more than by being in all Causes civil supreme, they can of themselves make a Law obligatory upon their Subjects. Their Supremacy, in Church as well as State, consisting not in a legislative but executive Authority only. But to shew, that you Gentlemen of the Dissention are not very consistent with one another; be it remembered, that when King James the first, after the Conference at Hampton Court, had by his Commission authorised the Archbishop of Canturbury, and others, to make some Alterations in the Liturgy, and, by his Proclamation only, required them to be received; the Dissenters then, for whose Sake they were made, did not think that

(a) 3 Letter, p. 22.

(b) *Ibid.*

that the King had Authority to do this (a). But now you, when you think the Church of *England* may be pinched by it, in direct Terms assert, that our Kings or Queens are all in all, and, agreeable to our Constitution, have a Power to do every Thing; and that the Bishops and Clergy, nay, and the People too, have nothing else to do, but reverently to receive such Alterations and Additions they shall, at any Time, please to make in the Service of the Church. But is not this, Sir, somewhat like blowing hot and cold out of the same Mouth, just as it seems best to suit your Occasions?

There are some few Things more I have to take Notice of in this Section, which you have throwed together in the last Paragraph of it. Where you say, "By our present Constitution
" the King alone, or at least by Consent of
" Parliament, hath undoubted *Power* to divide
" the twenty-six Bishopricks into as many Hundred; and thus to render them more like the
" Bishopricks of the first Ages, when every
" Christian Bishop took the Oversight of no
" more than he could personally know, and
" than could communicate at one Table." As to its being *lawful* for our Civil Rulers to divide the twenty-six Bishopricks, into as many as they please, I say, What then? What Inconvenience can this be to the Church, so long as they shall be capable of judging what is *expedient*. But, that *the Bishopricks of the first Ages were so small, that every Christian Bishop took the Oversight of no more than he could personally know, and than could communicate at one Table*, is a
Position

(a) Dr. *Nicholl's* Preface to his Paraph. on the Common Prayer, p. 7, 8.

Position that has been so judiciously, so learnedly, and so fully proved to be false, by Bishop *Stillingfleet*, in Answer to Mr. *Baxter*, that I never expected to have seen it advanced by any of you again (a). To that Author I shall therefore recommend you for your better Information, not only in this, but in most other Matters you have objected against the Church of *England* throughout your three Letters.

You add, moreover, that the civil Rulers have a Power to new-frame the whole Order of publick Worship; to abolish its present Articles Ceremonies and Forms; and to substitute none at all, or quite new ones, in their Stead. Nay, while your Hand was in, you might have added a great deal more, even that they have a Power to cast the Christian Religion itself intirely from under their Protection, and to prohibit the free Exercise of it in their Dominions. But to what Purpose are such Surmises as these? Though our civil Rulers may have this Power; Why should we apprehend that they would, at all Times, do all that they have a Power to do, and act like mere inanimate Bodies, with their whole Force and Weight, without either Reason or Judgment to direct them? But allowing our civil Rulers to have a Power to do all that you have said; yet, I hope, I have made it appear, from Archbishop *Wake's* State of the Church, that it never has been hitherto Customary for them to make any material Alterations in the State of this Church, either as to its Doctrine or Discipline, without the previous Consent of *the Ministers of Christ, and Stewards*
of

(a) Unreasonableness of Separation, Part III. Sect. 8, 9, 10.

of the Mysteries of God (a), that is, the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation assembled.

Having now gone through your third Section, and taken Notice of every Thing that seemed to me material in it, I shall return to your second, which is,

Of the Sacramental Test.

In the Beginning of this Section, you say, *the Test Law enjoins the Sacrament as a Mean, and with Intent, to discriminate and divide Christians.* But what Reason, what Foundation, could you have for saying so? When you could not but know, that they were divided; nay, the very Nature of a Test does suppose, that there was a Division amongst them before.

In the Rubrick, after our Communion Service, which was established by the Authority of the same Legislature, and that long before the Test Act was thought of, it is ordained, that every Parishioner shall communicate at least three Times in the Year. From saying three Times in the Year *at least*, it is manifest, that this Church looked upon it as a Duty incumbent upon Christians to receive the Communion more often; and therefore, when it is required of any Member of it (for such only it was supposed would do it) to communicate, upon being admitted to a Post in the Government, it is really no more than what he ought to have done without. There is, consequently, no more Foundation in reason for saying, that it is a *Prostitution and Perversion of this holy Sacrament*, to require Persons to receive it upon being admitted

(a) 1 Cor. iv. 1.

mitted to a Post, under the Penalty of forfeiting it, than there is in ordering, that they shall receive it three Times in the Year, *at least*, under Penalties of another Sort.

In the next Place you tell us, that you had before objected, that, “ by the Force of this “ Act, Multitudes of needy Persons are compelled to come to the Lord’s Table.” Why Persons that are needy ought not to be obliged to come to the Lord’s Table, as often as others, I own I cannot see the Reason. But, however this may be, these needy Persons must be either of our own, or of the Communion of those who dissent from us. If they are of our own Communion, What greater Hardship is laid upon them by this Act, than there was before by the Rubrick, after the Communion Service, and the XXIst Canon; whereby they are required to receive the Sacrament, at least three Times in the Year, and are liable to be presented if they do not? You yourself, I presume, will own it to be the Duty of every one, who professes and calls himself a Christian, to communicate as frequently as he can: And can you then think it a reasonable Exception against any Church, that it makes Use of every Consideration to engage Men to the frequent Performance of what is their Duty frequently to do? But if your Concern is expressed for those of your own Communion; Yet how are they compelled? Why, not at all; for there is no Force or Compulsion used towards them; they are left entirely at their Liberty, whether they will communicate with us or not. But from your using the Word *compelled*, a Stranger might have been induced to imagine, that they were to be driven

to

to it with Whips and Scourges. Whereas, upon some temporal Considerations only, they do prevail with themselves to receive the Sacrament in our Church; when, if left to their own Choice, they would probably have rather done it in their own. However, this their voluntary Compliance, together with several even of your Ministers also submitting, upon some certain Occasions, to be ordained in our Church, and conforming intirely to it, does plainly declare, that there are many among you, and that even of those who ought to be reputed most learned and knowing in these Matters, who do not look upon those Points, upon which your Schism was begun, and is still continued, to be of that sinful Nature, some may be persuaded they are: For, ought it to be supposed, that those of you, who either occasionally communicate, or who wholly conform, do it, though they think it at the same Time to be a Sin? God forbid: *I am persuaded better Things of them, and Things which accompany Salvation.* Where then is the Unreasonableness, where the Hardship, that Persons, by a lawful Authority, should be required to receive the Sacrament in our Church, the doing of which they must be satisfied is no Sin!

After this you endeavour to prove, what you had asserted in your first Letter, that *the Priest has no Power to refuse the Lord's Supper to the vilest Person that demands it as a Qualification for a Post*; and this, by what you are pleased to call *an equitable Construction of the Law called the Test*; Upon which you argue in this Manner, "For the same Law, which requires, " under severe Penalties, all Persons in Posts

“ to receive the Lord’s Supper, according to
 “ the Usage of the Church of *England*, does,
 “ by indisputable Consequence, require some
 “ one to give it.”

Had you said, that in enacting this Law, the Legislature did suppose, that there were some to administer it, your *Consequence* probably might then have been thought to have been more *indisputable*. For wherefore is it reasonable to imagine, that those who made that Law did think any particular Person’s holding a Post to be of that indispensable Consequence, that former Acts must *be deemed repealed*, and that every Thing, right or wrong, must give Way to it? Where is the Equitableness, to construe any Act of Parliament, whereby an Obligation is expressly laid upon one Person, so as to oblige another, who is not so much as once mentioned in it? Perhaps, Sir, you would not have thought such a Construction at all equitable, had any but the Clergy of the Church of *England* been to have been affected by it. But, admitting that the Legislature *in requiring, under severe Penalties, all Persons in Posts to receive the Lord’s Supper, according to the Usage of the Church of England, did also require some one of the Clergy to administer it*, yet would not that Consequence you have drawn from it be logically true, *viz.* that, “ Therefore, whatever Power the Rubrick gave the Curate to repel open and notorious evil Livers from the Table of the Lord, before the Test Act took Place, in Cases of Qualification, is now unquestionably superseded, and the Rubrick virtually repealed;” for if it does *require* the Minister to give the Sacrament to such as are in Posts, the

the more true and natural Consequence certainly is, that it does require him to do it, according to the established and known Rules of the Church, unless it gave some Directions to the contrary; and not that the Power vested in the Minister by the Rubrick *is superseded*, and that the Rubrick itself, authorised by the Act of Uniformity, *is virtually repealed*.

But in the latter End of this Section you acquaint us, that “ all you plead for, in speaking against the Test, is the Removal of the “ Incapacity, under which you unjustly lie, the “ breaking a disgraceful Yoke, which the Test “ hath put upon your Necks, and the Restoring “ you to your native Freedom Honour and “ Right.” But did not the episcopal Party lie under a more unjust *Incapacity*, and was not a much more *disgraceful Yoke* laid upon their Necks by the solemn League and Covenant, during the Time that Presbytery, and Independency too, were in the Meridian of their Power? Were not they, by that Test, deprived of their *native Freedom Honour and Right*? And a Test was so far from being looked upon, by your Predecessors, as unjust or disgraceful, when others were to be affected by it, that the solemn League and Covenant, which was to all Intents and Purposes a Test, past the then Assembly of Divines, as a Thing both *lawful and pious* (a). Have not all Christian States a Right to establish which shall be the national Church of their respective Dominions; requiring all to conform unto it, who will hold any Post of Trust or Profit in them? Has not the Republick of *Holland*, has not that of *Geneva*, done the same?

F 2

Do

(a) *Clarendon's Hist. of Rebell. Vol. 2. p. 374. 8vo. Edit.*

Do they admit any to bear any Share in their civil Government, that do not conform to their national Church? What Reason then can there be, that the ruling Powers of this Nation should not have the Liberty to do the same here; to retain the episcopal Form of ecclesiastical Government upon the Reformation, being that which this Nation had been accustomed to, from Time immemorial, and which alone, I may venture to say, was ever known in the Church for the first fifteen hundred Years (a)? Why must the Church established by them be required to pull down its Fence, that Sectaries of all Denominations might rush in upon it, pull down, and trample under their Feet, at Pleasure? Nay, during the Time of the Usurpation, as either the Presbyterians or Independents prevailed, the solemn League and Covenant was the Test; and a most cruel and iniquitous one was it too, directly levelled against the Members of the episcopal Church of *England*, not requiring them to submit only to Things merely indifferent, but even to renounce the very fundamental Article of all their ecclesiastical Discipline, that is, the Government of the spiritual Part of the Church by Bishops: As may be seen in the second Article of it, as preserved by Lord *Clarendon*, in his History of the Rebellion (b). But Mr. *Baxter*, in his holy Commonwealth, with regard to incapacitating those who would not live in Communion with you, seems to propose incomparably harder Terms than those you complain of under the Church of

(a) Monf. *Le Moyne's* Letter, in *Stillington's* Unreaf. of Sep. p. 397.
 (b) History of Rebell. Vol. 2. p. 374. 8vo. Edit.

of *England*, so far as to disqualify them, not only from holding any Post in the State, but to deprive them of the Liberty of voting even for a Member of Parliament ; for in his 218th Thesis he says, “ No Man should be so free in
 “ our Commonwealth, as to be Choosers of our
 “ Parliament Men or Magistrates, that live
 “ not in Christian Order, and Communion for
 “ the ordinary worshipping of God, under the
 “ Discipline and Guidance of some faithful
 “ Pastors, where such are, either approved or
 “ tolerated by the Magistrate ;” to the same Effect speaks he also in his 219th Thesis : His approved Pastors are undoubtedly Presbyterian ; and whom he means by the tolerated ones, he lets us know in his Explication of his 218th Thesis, where he says, “ It is not an Anabaptist, nor an Independent, nor any upon such
 “ Kind of Differences I am mentioning the Exclusion of ; but those that are Members of
 “ no approved nor tolerated Church.” Here, we find, is a Provision made for the Admission of Anabaptists and Independents, and others upon such Kind of Differences into his Commonwealth, but none for Members of the episcopal Church ; which, the Authors of the Vindication of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry have fairly informed us, had been abjured of old by their Covenant (a). And with what greater Tenderness ought we to expect to be treated by you at present, if we lay at your Mercy, who are pleased to look upon us as *declaring ourselves, before the World, the Offspring of a filthy withered old Harlot* (b). You have not then the least Reason to complain of the

F 3

Yoke

(a) Vindication, &c. p. 12.

(b) 3 Letter, p. 63.

Yoke the Test Act lays upon your Necks, when compared with that which your Predecessors thought both *lawful* and *pious* to be laid upon the Necks of others. For, notwithstanding the present Test, you enjoy a full Liberty of Conscience, which was a Privilege not allowed by them to the episcopal Party. You are disqualified at most only for holding a Post in the Government ; whereas, upon Mr. *Baxter's* System, the Members of the episcopal Church were to be deprived even of the common Rights and Privileges of free-born Subjects. If Mr. *Baxter's* Principles be really just, you can have no Sort of Pretence or Plea for complaining ; for, in his Explanation of his forecited 218th Thesis, he furthermore says, that “ they
 “ who excommunicate themselves from Chris-
 “ tian Churches, can blame none but them-
 “ selves for it, and have no Reason to expect
 “ to be taken for Rulers or Choosers in a Chris-
 “ tian Commonwealth ;” now this is really the Case with you ; you have actually excommunicated yourselves by separating from us ; because there never was any formal Sentence of Excommunication pronounced against you by our Church : For as to those general Excommunications, in some of our Canons, Bishop *Stillingfleet* has shewed, from *Lyndwood*, that, according to the Practice of Canon Law in *England*, a declaratory Sentence of the Judge was necessary, notwithstanding the Excommunication *ipso facto* ; and he makes it appear, that Mr. *Baxter* himself was of the same Opinion ; who, in his Plea for Peace, expressed himself thus, *although we are excommunicated ipso facto, yet we are not bound ourselves to execute their Sentence ;*

tence ; but may stay in Communion till they prove the Fact, and do the Execution on us themselves by refusing us (a) : Having therefore excommunicated yourselves, in Mr. Baxter's Judgment, you see, you have no Reason to expect to be taken either for Rulers or Choosers.

But as I have had Occasion to refer to Mr. Baxter's Holy Commonwealth, there is one Quotation more I would beg Leave to make before I have done with it, and that is, from his 24th Thesis, where he says, that " the tolerated Churches shall not be suffered to cast Scorn upon the approved Churches, nor be over busy or publick in drawing others to their Mind, supposing them to have Leave to worship God themselves in their tolerated Way, and modestly to defend themselves under the Magistrates Moderation : " How well you have observed that most equitable Rule, of doing by others as you would be done by yourselves, and with what Temper and Moderation you have at any Time defended yourselves, and with what Decency and good Manners you have treated the established, or, to use your own Term, the approved Church of this Nation, Witness all your Writings from the first Beginning of your Separation to these your very latest Performances. But let us go on to your fourth Section,

Of Sponsors in Baptism.

Wherein you tell us, that *the Use of Sponsors, in all Cases of Parents Incapacity, you intirely approve of, and that in such Cases the Dissenters also*

F 4

use

(a) Unreasonableness of Seper. Part III. Sect. 33.

use them. But it is the setting aside Parents, the forbidding them to stand forth, and engage solemnly for the religious Education of the Child, that you dislike, because Parents are the properest to give this Security, as being the Persons to whom its Education is committed (a). That Parents have the Education of their Children committed to them is very true, neither is the Care of them taken off their Hands by any Appointment of the Church; for if it is ordered, by the XXIXth Canon, that "no Parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as Godfather for his own Child," it is, because they are looked upon as sufficiently engaged already, and consequently that there is no Occasion for their solemnly giving any further Security for this Purpose: For those Injunctions laid upon *Jewish* Parents, by the Law of *Moses*, carefully to instruct their Children upon every Occasion, in the Knowledge of their Covenant, are undoubtedly still obligatory to Christian Parents to train up theirs in that of the Gospel; and if the Church has superadded Sponsors, it is only that it might be provided against all Events that might happen, and, before their Minds might take any wrong Byass, for the timely Instruction of Children in those Principles the Knowledge of which is of the greatest Importance to them in the World.

Another Thing you disapprove of, is the receiving the Child to Baptism upon Account of its own Faith, and its own Promises expressed by its Sureties (b). In Answer to this I observe, that Baptism is a Covenant between God and Man, consisting of Promises of Graces and Privileges

on

(a) 3 Letter, page 25, 28.

(b) 3 Letter, page 25.

on God's Part, and of Faith and Obedience on Man's ; but as Children are not capable of making this Promise themselves on their Part, therefore the Church has thought proper to ordain, that this should be done by Sureties, in order to their being intitled, as soon as conveniently could be, to those gracious Promises of God made to those who are admitted into Covenant with him by this Sacrament. And that such Kind of Stipulation is allowable, your own Party has made appear, by making Use of it upon another Occasion : For when King *James* the First was crowned in *Scotland*, in his Infancy, " the Earl of *Morton* and Lord *Humes* " took Oath for the King; promising, that he " should maintain, to the utmost of his Power, " that Doctrine, and those Rites of Religion, " which were then publickly taught, and that " he should oppose Gainfayers (a) " : Of which Particular, that King made afterwards an especial Use, in justifying the Use of Godfathers and Godmothers at the baptizing of Infants, when it was questioned in the Conference at *Hampton Court* (b) : And that with very good Reason ; because the whole Business of that Coronation was contrived and carried on solely by the Presbyterian Party, in order to get the Power, as soon as possible, into their own Hands, out of those of the then reigning Queen. Now had there been a political Catechism for his Instruction in the Duty of a King, wherein such

(a) Jurarant pro eo in Leges Jacobus Mortonii Comes, & Alexander Humius, eam Doctrinam et Ritus Religionis, qui tum publice docebantur, quoad posset, servaturum, et contrarios oppugnaturum, polliciti. *Buchan. Rerum Scot. Histor. in initio Regni Jacobi* 6.

(b) *Heylin's History of Presbyterians*, p. 172.

such Question as this might have been made ; that since it was required, that Kings should promise and swear that they would maintain both the civil and religious Rights of the People ; How came he to be crowned, when, by reason of his tender Age, he was not capable of doing this himself ? What more proper Answer could have been put into his Mouth, than that he had done it by his Sureties ? Hence we see, from the Practice of your own Party, that they have thought it allowable for Children to promise and engage by their Sureties. But the Earl of *Morton* and Lord *Humes*, upon this Occasion, engaged that the King should do what there was not the same Obligation upon him for doing, that there is upon Children, when they come to Years of Discretion, for complying with what their Sponsors promise for them in Baptism ; because that King, when he came of Age to take the Government upon himself, was not so necessarily bound to approve of, or uphold, that Form of ecclesiastical Discipline, they were then setting up in that Nation, as Children are to observe what their Godfathers and Godmothers engage for them in their Baptism ; for what they undertake for, is, that the Children, when they come to Age, shall believe what God has declared, and do what he has commanded ; which certainly is what every one would be most strictly and indispensibly bound both to believe and to do, whether such Engagement had been made for him or not. Since, therefore, our Sponsors engage for no more than what Children would be indispensibly bound to perform, whether they engaged for them or not ; and being persuaded (or at least
it

it is what every one who professes, and calls himself a Christian ought to be) that the manner of doing it, as set forth in the Gospel, is most rational and agreeable; joined too to that Care and Concern they have taken upon themselves, for their due and timely Instruction in the Knowledge thereof; they may with very good Security promise, that they *should renounce the Devil and all his Works*; that they *should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith*; and that they *should keep God's holy Will and Commandments, and walk in the same all the Days of their Lives*. And it is no unusual Thing, even in common Life, for Persons to say, they will warrant, they will engage, they will answer that another shall or will do a Thing, merely upon their taking it for granted that it will appear, when proposed to him, so much for his Pleasure or Advantage, or so agreeable to his Inclination, that they cannot entertain the Suspicion that he will refuse it. And upon this very Foundation must it have been, that you have so boldly promised, that all your Brethren, *if our Church commands them to sign themselves all over with a significant and instructive Cross, will reverently do it*; with much more to the same Purpose; nay, lastly, that *there is nothing our Church can injoin or decree, but the Dissenters will be found dutifully submitting to it*, when our Church is clearly shewn to have Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith (a): Though you could not possibly have had the same Assurance that the Dissenters would do all this, that our Sponsors have, that the Children they undertake for, will believe

(a) 3 Letter, p. 12.

believe what God has declared, and do what he has commanded.

But you have moreover argued against the Use of Sponsors, from their Neglect of Duty, in that *they too generally with great Levity shake off the Charge again, and throw it over to the Parents.* But if the Abuse or Neglect of any Institution were a reasonable Objection against it, such arguing might possibly be used, with too great Cogency, even against Institutions of the most indispensable Obligation. That Sponsors do too generally Neglect their Duty, must with Concern be confessed; and to this their Neglect, that general Disposition to Infidelity, which at present seems so much to prevail, has been thought to be owing (*a*); and that perhaps not without very good Reason; but then the Prevalence of Infidelity and Vice, which is but too discernable, is not only a Reflection upon Sponsors, for their great and scandalous Neglect of Duty, but also upon Parents themselves; and shows, that however proper they are to take Care of the Education of their own Children, and how much soever they are by Nature and Duty obliged to it, yet must they be very deficient in this Respect. The Jewish Parents, under the Mosaical Institution, had undoubtedly as much Regard for their Children, from the Ties of natural Affection, as Christian Parents can have for theirs at present; and were moreover expressly commanded, by their Law, to take especial Care to train them up in the Knowledge of God, and of his Laws (*b*); and yet how prone were they to Idolatry, and how

(*a*) Dr. Clark's Pract. Essay on Baptism, Ch. 6.

(*b*) Deut. Chap. iv. 7.

how often did they actually apostatize into it; which surely could never have been, had not the Parents been extremely deficient in the Discharge of that Duty they were bound to perform, both from the Dictates of Nature, and the express Command of God. And that this Proneness to Idolatry among the *Jews* was really owing to the Neglect of Duty in the Parents, may be confirmed from this Observation; because, that, as soon as Synagogues were set up, wherein that Business, which by the Law of *Moses* had been left entirely to the Parents, but which they seem too generally to have neglected, was more regularly and punctually performed, we find, that, so far from being any longer prone to Idolatry, they, on the contrary, proved ever after most tenacious of their Religion. These Considerations afford a sufficient Justification of our Church for retaining the use of Sponsors in Baptism; that others, besides the Parents, might be engaged in that most concerning and important Charge, about which there can never be too much Caution used. But I proceed to your next Section,

Of Confirmation.

Speaking of which you say, that *the only Rite, after Baptism, you find either instituted or practised by Christ and his Apostles, to make a publick Recognition of our baptismal Engagements, in the Face of a Christian Congregation, is the celebrating the Lord's Supper.* That every Person, who receives the Lord's Supper, does occasionally acknowledge that he stands to his baptismal Engagement, is very true; but that that

Supper

Supper was either instituted by Christ, or celebrated afterwards by his Apostles, for that Purpose, does not appear. For our Saviour ordered his Disciples to do it in Remembrance of him (a). And St. Paul speaks of it as a Thing often to be done, and not once, by way of *Recognition of our baptismal Engagements*; where he says, that *as often as we do eat that Bread, and drink that Cup, we do shew forth the Lord's Death till he come* (b).

Again you tell us, that “there are few, you suppose none, of our learned Bishops and Divines but perfectly know, that the Ceremony of Confirmation is no Part of genuine and primitive Christianity.” How you came to be so well acquainted with the Sentiments of our learned Bishops and Divines, upon this Occasion, you have not informed us. But if, by saying, that *Confirmation is no Part of genuine Christianity*, you mean, that it was not instituted by Jesus Christ himself, it is more than you could have any justifiable Grounds for asserting. For we find the laying on of Hands (the same we mean by Confirmation) to have been so far Primitive, at least, as to have been both very early practised, and looked upon, by the Apostles themselves, as one of the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ: Which affords a very strong Presumption, that they did it by the Direction of Jesus Christ. That it was practised by the Apostles themselves, we learn from Acts the viiith, where we read, that *when the Apostles, which were at Jerusalem, had heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who laid their Hands on them,*

(a) Luke xxii. 19.

(b) 1 Cor. xi. 26.

them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And again, Acts the ninth, we are told, that the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of St. Paul's Hands, came upon some who had been newly baptized. Nay, St. Paul, Hebr. vi. 1, 2, speaks of the laying on of Hands as of one of the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, where he says, *therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto Perfection, not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works and of Faith towards God, of the Doctrine of Baptism, and of laying on of Hands, and of the Resurrection of the Dead, and of eternal Judgment.* And Beza, in his Comment upon this Place, says, *the Apostle enumerates five Heads of the Catechism,* (he should have said six, for so many there are, unless he looked upon Baptism and laying on of Hands, to make but one) *and that those therefore were delivered down under short and few Heads in the Beginning of the Catechism, as the principal ones of our Religion, as indeed they are (a).* Since therefore it appears, that this Ordinance was administered, and looked upon, by the Apostles themselves, as one of the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, it sufficiently justifies our Bishops, who are undoubtedly their Successors, for administering it after their Example.

In the next Place, speaking of that Part of the first Collect in our Office of Confirmation, where the Bishop addresses God, *as having vouchsafed to regenerate these his Servants by Wa-*
ter

(a) *Quinque Capita Catechismi numerat — tradebantur ergo ista Catechismi initio brevibus et paucis, tanquam præcipua Religionis nostræ Capita, ut sane sunt. Beza in Hebr. Chap. vi. 1, 2.*

ter and the Holy Ghost, and to give them Forgiveness of all their Sins; you say it is “ an Expression taken probably from some ancient Liturgy, and which was suitable and well adapted to those Times, when Confirmation was performed immediately after Baptism, but is utterly incongruous and unsuitable to ours.” But herein you have charged the Compilers of our Liturgy, upon Conjecture only, with such Absurdity and Ignorance, as ought not, in common Decency, to have been imputed, without very warrantable Authority, to any who were of far less Reputation for their Knowledge in the antient Liturgies than they certainly were. But to shew you how little they do deserve to have such Reflections cast upon them, and that the Expression is most apposite and proper, I shall consider both its true Import and the Design of the Compilers of our Liturgy in using it.

As to the true Import of it, it is to be observed, that Regeneration is in the New Testament put for Baptism; as John iii. 3. where our Saviour says, *except a Man be born again*, that is, regenerated, *he cannot see the Kingdom of God*; and in verse 5, he explained what he meant by being born again, by saying, *except a Man be born of Water and the Holy Spirit*, that is, baptized; and St. Paul, Titus iii. 5, calls Baptism *the washing of Regeneration*: And in this Sense, and no other, is it used throughout our Liturgy (a). Again, we learn also from the Scripture, that Baptism was for the Remission of Sins; in which Sense St. Peter speaks of it, Acts

(a) See Dr. Nicholl's Notes, in his Paraph. upon Publick Baptism.

Acts ii. 38, where he persuades the *Jews* to *repent, and to be baptized for the Remission of Sins*; and St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 11. where, after having put them in Mind that some of them had been very notorious Sinners, he adds, *but ye are washed*, that is, by baptism, *but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified*; and again, Titus iii. 4, 5, he says, *but after the Kindness and Love of God our Saviour toward Men appeared, not by Works of Righteousness, which we have done, but according to his Mercy, he saved us, by the washing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*. And accordingly, in our Liturgy, Remission of Sins is always spoken of, as immediately consequent upon Baptism. And moreover, to make it appear that the Expression, here objected to, is really congruous and suitable to the Occasion it is used upon, let it be considered, that when the Bishop speaks of those who come to be confirmed, as of such as are *regenerated*, and all whose Sins are forgiven, he does not do it upon Account of any Thing that had been done by himself; but only in Consequence of the Answer they had made to the Question he had at first proposed to them: He had asked them, whether they did there, in the Presence of God, and of that Congregation, renew the solemn Promise and Vow that was made in their Name at their Baptism, &c. and upon each of them answering, *I do*; though they had indeed been baptized in their Infancy upon the Engagement of their Sureties, yet, then, taking this Engagement upon themselves by their own Consent and free Acknowledgement, he from that Time looks upon them as adult Persons, whose baptismal Covenant is then

G

completely

completely ratified and confirmed ; and consequently, without any Incongruity, might say the same of them, as of other adult Persons but newly baptized. For if, as you yourself allow (a), it may suitably be said of such adult Persons, that God had regenerated them by Water and the Holy Ghost, and had given them Forgiveness of all their Sins ; wherefore should it not, with equal Propriety, be said of those who first take their baptismal Covenant upon themselves, and then make, in their own Persons, the very same Acknowledgement which is required from those who come to be baptized in their riper Years ? Be it therefore never so probable, as you have been pleased to say upon Conjecture only, that this Expression in the first Collect of the Office of Confirmation was taken from some ancient Liturgy, and that it was suitable and well adapted to those Times, when Confirmation was performed immediately after Baptism ; yet I hope, from what has been said upon it, it appears to be very congruous and suitable also to ours. And moreover, according to the foregoing Explanation, there can be no greater Reason to apprehend that our Office of Confirmation, as now administered, should have *an apparent Tendency to cherish a delusive Hope, and to speak Peace to such Persons as are not by the Christian Covenant entitled to it,* than to say of any adult Person, upon his being baptized, that his Sins are forgiven ; or that this delusive Hope was cherished in the Minds of the *Corinthians*, from St. Paul's telling them that they *were washed*, that they *were sanctified*, that they *were justified*.

You

(a) 3 Letter, p. 32.

You have yet two or three Observations more, with Regard to Confirmation, which deserve to be taken Notice of.

The first is, that Presbyters did also confirm. This is said without any Authority to support it; and therefore, in Answer to it, I can only assure the Reader, that if by Presbyters be meant any order in the Ministry inferior to the Apostolical, there is not any one Text of Scripture, that can give the least Countenance to such an Opinion; and so leave it to him to chuse to which of us he will give the greater Credit. What you say further on this Subject concerns some Irregularities, the Performance of this Service gives occasion to, *viz.* the light and perfunctory Manner in which it is too often administered in the Church; and the Conclusion of the Day afterwards by many in Riot and Disorder. As to the first, it is, I believe, performed at Church, generally speaking, with as much Decency and Decorum, as the Nature of such a promiscuous Assembly will admit of. And if their Lordships, the Bishops, thought that they gave any reasonable Cause of Offence to any, we need not doubt, but that they would be very willing, either to do it more frequently, or at more different Places; by which Means they would, in great Measure, prevent the assembling of so large a Number at one Place, as by the usual Method there generally is. As to the other, that Riot and Disorder conclude the Day, it is what I never heard complained of before. As many are obliged to come from a considerable Distance to meet the Bishops upon these Occasions, they may possibly go into Inns, and take some Refreshment before they return:

But if they should exceed the Bounds of Decency, I believe there are very few of the Church of *England* but would be as heartily sorry for it as you yourself can possibly be. However, admitting this Objection to be really true in Fact, it must be confest to be a very great Abuse; but then the most proper Inference undoubtedly would be, that all means ought to be used in order to correct it, rather than that an Institution, which was looked upon by the Apostles themselves as a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ, should be set aside upon Account thereof.

I proceed to Section VI. which follows in the next Place; at the Head of which is prefixed,

The Terms of Ministerial Conformity hard and terrible — Lay dissent justified — The rise of the Separation.

In the Beginning whereof you acquaint us, that “ next after Confirmation, you had considered two other Offices of our Liturgy, viz. “ *Absolution of the Sick; and Burial of the Dead;* “ and shewed them, you apprehend, to be liable to manifest and great Exceptions, and “ to have no friendly Aspect upon the *Morals* “ and Souls of Men.” Before I take into Consideration what you have here objected, I must observe to you, that there is no such Office in our Liturgy as *Absolution of the Sick*, but *Visitation of the Sick*, in which there is indeed a Form of Absolution appointed; but not to be used, unless the Person visited does *humbly and heartily desire it*. But let us now examine what you have objected to these two Offices, before
I proceed

I proceed to consider what you have advanced in support of the several Assertions in the Front of this Section. And first of Absolution; with Regard to which, I observe, that the Authority for it is in the first Place founded upon St. *John* xx. 21, 22, 23. *Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you. As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* And because there is thought to be no more in Forgiveness of Sins, than in Reconciliation of God and Man, therefore, in the next Place, this Authority is supported from 2 *Cor.* v. 18, 19. wherein this Work of Reconciliation is by St. *Paul* said to be committed to the Ministry, where it is written, *And all Things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us* (whom, 1 *Cor.* iv. 1. he would have accounted of as the Ministers of Christ and Stewards of the Mysteries of God) *the Ministry of Reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them, and hath committed unto us the Word of Reconciliation.* But then, even among those who allow this Power to be in the Ministers of the Church, there is a very great Difference of Opinion, both with Regard to the Bounds, and Manner of its Execution. As for the Bounds of it, these the Church of *Rome* has extended to a very unjustifiable, nay blasphemous, Degree; so far as to maintain that the Pope, nay even the meanest Priest, does properly, directly, and ab-

solutely forgive Sins; which the Church of *Eng-land* holds to be the peculiar Province of God alone. And therefore, in the Business of Absolution, she acknowledges only a ministerial limited Power; as appears from the several Forms of Absolution appointed to be used in its several Services: For that, after the general Confession in the Daily Morning and Evening Services, is, plainly, only declarative; the second, in the Communion Office, is in the Manner of a Prayer; the third, which is in the Visitation of the Sick, is supposed to be too absolute, upon which Account it has been most generally excepted against: Whereas, perhaps, in the most exceptionable Part, where the Minister says, *by the Authority of Christ committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy Sins, in the Name of the Father, &c.* which is esteemed too absolute, it may be found, upon a fair and nearer Examination, to differ very little, if any Thing at all, from a merely declarative Form; which may be made appear more clearly from this one single Instance, than by a Multitude of Arguments, *viz.* suppose his Majesty had an Inclination to pardon a Criminal under Sentence of Death, provided he would comply with some certain Conditions he should require; and accordingly did depute a Person with proper Authority to examine him upon those Conditions, and, if he found that he complied, to give him his Pardon; where would be the Difference, were the Person so deputed, to say, I, *by the Authority committed to me* by the King, do pardon you for your Crime; or that the King by me doth pardon you for it: The latter Manner of Expression would be merely declarative; and consequently

sequently the former must be so too; because, however differently expressed, the Intention must still be the same; which was only to declare, that the King did pardon the Criminal.

But perhaps it may be thought, that any such ministerial Declaration to a repenting Sinner may be needless, since God has sufficiently declared his Intention of pardoning such, already, in the Gospel; and that in such plain Terms, that every Man may understand them, both with Regard to his own and also the Condition of others. That God hath in the Gospel declared his Intention to pardon Sinners, who sincerely repent, and that in very intelligible Terms, is undeniably true; and so had he, in the Old Testament, been as express and particular in his Directions for the discerning of the Leprosy, which is supposed to have a typical Relation to the Pollutions of Sin; and every Person among the *Jews*, from these Directions, might have known whether he himself or any other was clean or not, without Application to the Priests; yet was it in the Priests alone to pronounce authoritatively when it was legally cleansed. And when Persons have been solemnly confessing their Sins to God, very proper surely must it be, that there should be one on God's Part, who might, upon every such Occasion, authoritatively declare unto them his most gracious Purpose herein. And there can be no more Reason to apprehend, that this Notion of Absolution *should have no friendly Aspect upon the Morals and Souls of Men*, than the more general Declarations of God, that he will pardon Sinners upon their unfeigned Repentance.

But secondly; neither yet will those Particulars ex-

cepted against in our burial Service, when impartially weighed, be found to have *no friendly Aspect upon the Morals and Souls of Men*. It is objected against our Burial Service, that therein we call the most wicked Sinner our dear Brother; and say, that it hath pleased God in his great Mercy to take such a one to himself; we thank him that he hath delivered him out of the Miseries of this sinful World; that we pray we may rest in Christ as we hope he doth; and lastly, that this Expression, *we hope the Persons buried do rest in Christ*, is contradictory to the Athanasian Creed, wherein it is said, that those who deny the Trinity cannot be saved; and yet in reading the burial Service over such, we hope they may be so. These are the Objections which have been made against our burial Office. And in considering them, I shall begin with our saying that we hope the Person buried does rest in Christ: Because this, once cleared up, will be of great Service in resolving most of the other Objections. And in order to discharge this of its Difficulties, I observe, that where there is not an actual Impossibility that a Thing might or might not happen, there is Room consistently to hope that it may or may not do so; though it must be owned, that the Foundation for our Hope will always be stronger or weaker in Proportion to the Degrees of Probability, for or against it, as they are either greater or less. Hence then, since we cannot know what passes in the Mind of a very wicked Sinner, in his latest Moments; the secret Remorse of Conscience he at such Times may feel; nor how far such Repentance may be acceptable to God, who alone can know either it or the sincerity

sincerity thereof; no one surely will offer to say, that it is impossible for even such a one to be saved, how much soever the Probabilities may be against it; and therefore we may say very consistently, we hope he may be so. The same may be said also, with Respect to those who have denied the Doctrine of the Trinity. We cannot possibly know, what a Change for the better may have been wrought in their Minds in their latest Moments also. No one, I believe, will venture to affirm, that it was impossible for any such Change to have been effected, however, improbable, it may seem to be; consequently we may, without any Imputation of Absurdity, hope that it has been so; and may therefore consistently say, we hope that he also may rest in Christ. And upon the same Presumption, that is, hoping that such may still be in a State of Salvation, because we cannot be certain that they are not, we thank God that he hath delivered them out of the Miseries of this sinful World; and say, that he hath in his great Mercy taken them to himself.

But if such Expressions as these are, as you say, *a fatal Snare to the Souls of Men*, then are there some of the like import, in the holy Scripture itself, which may be thought liable to the same Exception. *Solomon, Eccles. iii. 21.* without discriminating between the Righteous and the Wicked, says of the Soul of Man, in general, that it goeth upward. Might it not, with equal Propriety, be urged against this Text, that wicked Men might take Occasion from it, to harden themselves in their Sins, since here they are told that their Souls are to go upward, directly opposite to the received Opinion, that they were to
take

take a quite contrary direction? Again, Chap. xii. 7. he says, *Then shall the Dust return to the Earth as it was: And the Spirit shall return to God who gave it.* Here likewise, there is no Distinction between the Righteous and the Wicked; but the Spirits or Souls of Men in general are to return to God who gave them, as universally as their Bodies were to return to the Earth from whence they were taken. But who ever imagined, that wicked Men could take Occasion from hence to conceive that their Souls will be in Favour with God, because the Souls of all Men, and consequently theirs among the rest, are to return to him. Now that Part of our burial Service, which is read immediately after the Body is laid in the Ground, is little more than a Paraphrase upon this Text of *Solomon's*; and notwithstanding it is therein said, that God hath taken to himself the Souls of such as are departed; it does not from thence follow, no more than from *Solomon's* saying they return to him, that he hath taken them to his Favour; but only that the Souls of Men in general are in the Hand of God, to be disposed of, in due Time, as he in his infinite Wisdom knows they have deserved; *some to everlasting Life, and some to Shame and everlasting Contempt,* Dan. xii. 2.

Having now examined the Objections you have made to those two Offices of our Liturgy, viz. Visitation of the Sick, and Burial of the Dead; and proved them, I hope, notwithstanding, not to be liable to those manifest and great Exceptions you apprehended; and that they are far from having no friendly Aspect upon the Morals and Souls of Men; I shall now take Notice of what
you

you have further advanced against the Church of *England* in this Section.

After many declamatory Invectives against the Liturgy, and the Act of Uniformity, whereby Subscription to it is required; you give us what you are pleased to call, “two ever-memorable Circumstances, from which the most flagrant Oppression and Tyranny of those Proceedings most strongly appear.” The first is taken from *Tong* of Schism, whom you introduce as saying, “It is a known and certain Truth, that the Liturgy, with its Alterations, to which they were *unfeignedly to assent*, came not out of the Press till *Bartholomew-Eve*; the Day ensuing which, [in the Act itself it is, some Lord’s Day before which] was the ultimate Time fixed by the Act, for the Ministers Subscription; so that all those throughout the Kingdom, who conformed, except a few in *London*, subscribed to they knew not what.” The same is again supported by a Hear-say-Testimony of Bishop *Burnet*’s, who says, that “the Matter was driven on with so much Precipitation, that it seemed the Clergy should subscribe implicitly to a Book they had never seen. This was done by too many, as the Bishops themselves informed me.” Now there were two Things, very different, and respecting different Engagements, required by this Act, which are blended together in this Extract from *Tong*: By the first, all Clergymen possessed of Livings were, in their respective Churches or Chapels, to read the Morning and Evening Service, according to the Book of Common Prayer authorised by that Statute, and publickly to declare,
before

before the Congregation then present, their unfeigned Assent and Consent to all the Offices contained therein, and this on some Lord's Day before the Feast of St. *Bartholomew* then next ensuing; by the other, all the Clergy in general, whether beneficed or not beneficed, that enjoyed any Promotion in the Church, all Persons concerned in the Education of Youth, either in a publick or private Capacity, whether of the Clergy or Laity, were to make another Sort of Declaration, and to subscribe it before their Diocesan, and this likewise before the Feast of St. *Bartholomew* then next ensuing. But whereas it was required by that Act, that the Service should be read some Lord's Day before the Feast of St. *Bartholomew*, if the Book did not come out of the Press till St. *Bartholomew-Eve*, as in truth it did not, it was impossible for any of the Clergy, even in *London* itself, to have done it by the Time prescribed by the Act; but then there was a Clause, whereby those were indemnified who transgressed against it, provided it was not owing to any wilful Neglect or Refusal; for, in the fifth Section, it is enacted "that all and every such Person, who shall (without some lawful Impediment, to be allowed and approved of by the Ordinary of the Place) neglect or refuse to do the same *within the Time* aforesaid, or (in Case of such Impediment) within one Month after such Impediment removed, shall, *ipso facto*, be deprived of all his spiritual Promotion;" and notwithstanding there does not seem to have been any Provision made in behalf of those who did not subscribe the Declaration also before the Feast of St. *Bartholomew*,

new, yet, as they were to declare, that they would conform to the Liturgy, as by Law established, their having not been able to see it before that Time, would undoubtedly have been deemed a very lawful Impediment. So far then was it, from any Persons being required by this Act to *subscribe to they knew not what*, that it was their own Fault, if they had not a whole Month's Time to consider of it. Very unbecoming therefore, as well as injurious, was that Reflection of Bishop Burnet's, that *it seemed expected the Clergy should subscribe implicitly to a Book they had never seen*. The Truth of it is, the Act of Uniformity taking a considerable Time in passing, made it late before the Book could go to the Press, and later therefore, by far, than was imagined, before it could be printed off. The Inconvenience then arising from the shortness of the Time allowed for subscribing was quite undesigned. But to prove it to have been such a *flagrant Act of Tyranny and Oppression*, as you have called it, you ought to have made it appear, that it was contrived with a premeditated Intention to have brought Men into such a Snare ; and this might have been done, only by shewing, that there was ever such a malignant Use made of it, as captiously to deprive any one Person of his Preferment, for not having subscribed punctually in Time ; for those who were deprived for refusing to subscribe at all are nothing to your Purpose. But of this there is not so much as one single Instance. And since there is not, all that Clamour you have made against the Church of *England* for its *Oppression and Tyranny*, must appear very disingenuous and mean, tending to
alienate

alienate the Affection of its Friends, and to exasperate the Passions of the prejudiced and unwary very undeservedly against it.

The second ever-memorable Circumstance of its Oppression and Tyranny that you have given, is, that Persons either then possessed of, or to be admitted to, any spiritual Promotion, or were to be any way concerned in the Instruction of Youth, were required to subscribe to that Declaration, wherein, when the Act was first made, was this Clause, *I do declare, that it is not lawful, upon any Pretence whatever, to take Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that traiterous Position of taking Arms by his Authority against his Person, or against those that are commissioned by him.* It must be confessed, that, at the Restoration, People still smarting with the Wounds and Calamities of a civil War; and knowing, by sad Experience, the fatal Consequences of that Principle of an arbitrary Resistance, and considering into what Convulsions the State was liable to be thrown upon it, by the Malevolence of wicked and designing Men; they endeavoured to do all they could to prevent its ever producing such direful Effects here for the future. But, in doing this, while they sought to avoid one Extreme, they, as is often the Case, seem incautiously to have fallen into another, even that of almost no Resistance at all. That the Principle of Resistance, in those unhappy Times, both in Theory and Practice, was carried too great a Length, the most moderate of the Dissenters themselves will not, I believe, deny. If then your Party erred in one Extreme, it should have moved you to have made some Allowance, if the opposite one, who

laid no claim to Infallibility, did the same in another. But if this was what drove your Predecessors out, and gave Rise to the Separation, as you pretend ; What is it that has so long kept, and still keeps, it up ? What is it that has kept you their Successors out ? Since this Clause has been repealed above these threescore Years (a).

But, if you imagine that this Clause gave Rise to your Separation, and would justify it thereby, you are mistaken : Because your Separation was certainly first made in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, if not in that of King *Edward* the Sixth, when there was no such Clause in either of the Acts of Uniformity made in their Reigns.

After this you give us a most pompous Elogium of those of your Ministers, who, to the Amount of two Thousand, as you tell us, were deprived of their Livings, for refusing to subscribe according to the Act of Uniformity upon Account of this Clause (b) ; but you forget to let your Readers know, how far greater a Number of poor episcopal Clergy had been illegally turned out of theirs, *with their starving Families*, not many Years before, because they could not take the solemn League and Covenant. I have observed this, only to shew that Presbytery itself, when it has Power, and sees proper to pull off the Mask, can be tyrannical and oppressive also in her Turn. But to proceed.

The seventh and eighth Sections, which follow next, (the first, To correct several gross Misrepresentations of the Dissenters ; the other, To prove Dissenters not inconsistent, in submitting to some Ceremonies and refusing others)

I shall

(a) 1 K. W. & M.

(b) 3 Lett. p. 39.

I shall pass over; leaving it to Mr. *White's* Readers to judge, whether he has not properly supported his Charge in these Particulars; my Design being not to concern myself with what is done by others, but only to answer those Objections, which either, through Mistake or Misrepresentation, have been made against the Church of *England*. I shall therefore go forward to your ninth Section, which has for its Title,

*The egregious Absurdity of rejecting Presbyterian
and admitting Popish Ordinations.*

Wherein you look upon it as a mysterious and quite astonishing Partiality: Because the Hands and the devoutest Prayers of a Company of truly virtuous, religious and Christian Presbyters in Scotland or Geneva are not, it seems, allowed by the Church of England to be so efficacious, to send a Man forth a true Minister in the Church of Christ, as the Hands and superstitious Prayers of an antichristian idolatrous persecuting and wicked Bishop in Italy or Spain. But to clear up the Mystery of this, and to shew, that the Church of *England* is not byassed by Partiality, but acts upon just and rational Principles, let it be observed, in the first Place, That we believe, that as God, when he established his Covenant with the *Jews*, was pleased to institute the Aaronical Priesthood, so in that new Covenant, he had promised to make, which was to succeed the *Jewish*, he, as he had before declared, would institute also a new Priesthood, even a Priesthood for ever after the Order of
Mel.

Melchizedek (a): Which Priesthood was conferred by Jesus Christ, the Author of the New Covenant, upon eleven of his Disciples; and by them again upon others, who were to succeed them in it; from whence we believe, that it was to be kept up in the Church by a regular continued Succession, and that too by such only as were of apostolical Authority, to the End of the World. And in the next Place, allowing that this Succession has remained, amidst all her Corruptions, entire and uninterrupted in the Church of *Rome*, through which, as through a Channel only, it descended to us; and moreover conceiving, that the Efficacy of Ordination does not at all depend upon the moral worthiness of the Person who confers it, no more than the Efficacy of either of the Sacraments does upon that of the Minister who officiates; upon these Considerations it is, that we look upon the Ordination of such as have been ordained by Popish Bishops to be valid, and upon their renouncing the Errors of that Church do allow them to officiate among us; which we think we cannot consistently do by those, who receive their Ordination from such as make no Pretences to this Succession. Nay, moreover, if they did, yet as they are only Presbyters, and not of the apostolical Authority, we, upon our Principles, cannot esteem the Orders they confer to be good or valid, be they in other Respects never so *truly virtuous religious and Christian*; for we do not apprehend, that there is any Warrant in Scripture for believing that Persons, because indued with virtuous religious and Christian Qualities, are duely
H authorised

(a) Heb. vii. 11, 12.

authorised to send Labourers into their Lord's Harvest. And this, I hope, is sufficient to make it appear, that there is nothing *absurd*, nothing *mysterious* or *partial*, in the Practice of the Church of *England*, in rejecting Presbyterian, and admitting popish, Ordinations. Since it does not appear to be influenced, either by Favour for the Papists, or prejudice against the Presbyterians ; but to act upon rational and consistent Principles.

But you, moreover, endeavour to prove it absurd in us to allow of popish Ordinations ; because in one of the Homilies, which every Clergyman subscribes his solemn Approbation of, the Church of *Rome* is declared to have been far from being a true Church for nine hundred Years. This may be very true. But then what was it that made the Authors of those Homilies think it so far from being a true Church, but its having added to the true Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, which it seems still to have retained, many unwarrantable, nay impious, Doctrines, together with various absurd and superstitious Ceremonies. Such Additions were what rendered that Church very deservedly no true Church in the Opinion of our Reformers ; not its having omitted Things really and essentially necessary. And therefore, in Regard to the Ordination of that Church, if it omits nothing really and essentially necessary to it, then must it be good and valid, though many unnecessary, and even superstitious, Ceremonies, are made use of in conferring it. And agreeable to this is the Sentiment of the Authors of the Vindication of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry, who say, that *sinful*
Super-

Superadditions do not nullify divine Institutions (a). This was their Opinion, when the Question was moved by some, whether or no those Ministers, who had been episcopally ordained, and had joined themselves to them, should be allowed to officiate, without being ordained again in their Way? And, after some further Arguings upon it, they conclude, that *the Ordination of their Ministers by Bishops was lawful and valid for the Substance of it, though mingled with many circumstantial Defects (b).* Notwithstanding then all your most bitter Invectives against the Church of *Rome*, in order to amplify the Absurdity of our admitting popish Ordinations; yet you see, even upon the Concessions of your own Party, it ought to be looked upon as lawful and valid. However, after you have set off that Church in the blackest Colours which could well be assembled, you seem astonished, *that we, without Shame, confess ourselves before the World the Offspring of this filthy withered old Harlot.* But perhaps it will greatly encrease your Astonishment, when you find, that we declare no such Thing. To declare that, with regard to our Ordination, we were the Offspring of the Church of *Rome*, would be to acknowledge, that we derived the Authority of our Ministry from thence, as the Original and Foundation thereof; which is what we utterly disclaim. What we hold is this; that the Ministry was originally founded in the Church by Jesus Christ himself, and by him authoritatively delivered to his Apostles, and by them again settled in those Churches, which had been converted and established by them, to be conveyed down therein

H 2

by

(a) Vindication, &c. p. 142.

(b) *Ibid.* p. 144.

by a regular Succession; which Succession had been brought into this Nation, by means of Bishops, who had been ordained in the Church of *Rome*, who were the first that *converted* our *Saxon* Ancestors; and therefore through, not from, that Church, was our Ordination derived from the true Fountain and Original thereof, even Jesus Christ himself. And the Pipe, the Channel, which conveys the Water from the Fountain, may, with equal Propriety, be called the Fountain itself, as the Church of *Rome* the Origin of our Ordination. And notwithstanding that Church might have been then, as it still is, corrupt in many Particulars, yet may this Succession of the Ministry be continued down through it essentially pure, as well as sweet, clear, and wholesome Water, be conveyed through Pipes that are much furred, and through Channels that are deep in Mud.

Having now considered those Arguments, whereby you would prove it absurd in us to admit of popish Ordinations, taken from the Corruptions of that Church, and the Immorality of its Bishops; I shall examine those Texts of Scripture, and what other Proofs you have made use of, to give us more favourable Impressions of the Ordination by Presbyters.

The first Text of Scripture you produce for this Purpose is, 1 Tim. iv. 14. where it is said, that *Timothy* was ordained by *the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*. Now, if you design this Text as a Proof that Presbyters did ordain, I mean such as are now commonly designed by that Name, you beg the Question; in that you take it for granted, that this Presbytery here spoken of, was composed of Persons of a Rank
inferiour

inferiour to that of the Apostles, which ought to have been proved: Because there are very good Reasons for believing, that this Presbytery consisted of the Apostles themselves, or else of such as were of apostolical Authority; for the Word Presbyter, or *Elder*, was not originally appropriated to any particular Order in the Ministry; since we find, that the Apostles called themselves also *Elders*, as St. Peter calls himself so, where he writes, *the Elders that are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder—Feed the Flock of God, which is among you (a)*; and St. John, in the first Verse of each of his two last Epistles, stiles himself the *Elder*; whence an Assembly of the Apostles, or apostolical Persons, who were generally chosen out of such as were somewhat advanced in Years, might, with great Propriety, have been called also a Presbytery: Which is, I hope, sufficient to shew, that that Presbytery, mentioned in this Text of *Timothy*, is not indisputably such a one as you have taken it to be; and consequently cannot serve to give us any very favourable Impressions of the Ordination by Presbyters, in your Sense of the Word. The next Place you refer to, is Acts xiii. 1, 2, 3. whence you tell us, “that Paul and Barnabas were ordained by
 “certain Prophets and Teachers in the Church
 “of Antioch, and not by any Bishop (of whom
 “there is not a Word in all that Solemnity)
 “presiding in that City (b).” Here again, you have begged the Question in two very material Particulars. For, in the first Place, you have taken that for granted to have been an Ordination, which, I hope, before I have done, to

H 3

give

(a) 1 Peter v. 1, 2.

(b) 3 Lett. p. 56.

give very good Reason for believing to have been no Ordination at all ; and, in the second, you have likewise, upon no Authority but a bare Presumption only, taken those Prophets and Teachers, who were employed to confer this supposed Ordination, not to have been of the apostolical, the same with what we now call the episcopal, Order ; whereas the Presumption, that even those very Prophets and Teachers were really of the apostolical Rank, will be found, I believe, upon an impartial inquiry, to be at least as great, if not greater, than that they were of one inferior to it.

But first, that this was no Ordination at all. And in order to prove this, it will be only necessary to consider, who were the Persons that are supposed to have been ordained, who were *St. Paul and Barnabas*. Now *St. Paul*, speaking of his Apostleship, Gal. i. 1. calls himself *an Apostle not of Men, neither by Man ; but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father ;* the which he moreover likewise confirms, in the 15, 16, 17, verses of the same Chapter, where he says, *but when it pleased God, who separated me from my Mother's Womb, and called me by his Grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Heathen, immediately I conferred not with Flesh and Blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were Apostles before me ;* and in the 18th Verse he furthermore acquaints us, that it was full three Years after this his Call to the Apostleship, before he so much as saw any one of the other Apostles ; but, from Acts ix: 28, we learn, that he had been with the Apostles, coming in and going out, at *Jerusalem ;* and again, from Acts xi. v. 30. and xii. v. 25. that

hat he had been sent to *Jerusalem* in Company with *Barnabas*, and had returned again to *Antioch*; and all before this his supposed Ordination there, which we have the Account of in the Beginning of the 13th Chapter; so that his call to the Apostleship must have been antecedent to it. Since therefore, from these Considerations, it must appear undeniably true, that *St. Paul* had been called to be an Apostle long before this Time, and that too by an express Revelation from God; this surely could have been no Ordination to him; for what greater Power or Authority could he stand in need of, than what he had before received, in being made an Apostle by *Jesus Christ and God the Father*. Besides, if we put together what he has said of himself, 2 Cor. x. v. 8. the xi. v. 5. and xii. v. 11. we shall find, that, in Point of Authority, he looked upon himself as in nothing behind the very chiefest Apostles; which certainly he never could have done, had he been conscious of his having received his Apostleship even from the Apostles themselves; and much less surely, had he been *ordained by certain Prophets and Teachers* only, who were not of their Order. And notwithstanding the Proofs of *St. Barnabas's* Apostleship, before this Time, be not indeed so very clear; yet are there Reasons, which afford sufficiently strong Presumptions in favour of it. In the first Place, *St. Paul's* calling himself so expressly an Apostle, *not of Men*, neither *by Man*; and his assuring the *Galatians*, by a most solemn Appeal to God, that, so far from having received his Apostleship from those that had been Apostles before him, he had not so much as seen one of them, till above

three Years after he had been called by immediate Revelation; do yield very strong Reasons for believing, that both he and also the *Galatians* were persuaded, that there were Apostles of Men, and by Man; and that the Apostles did ordain others into their own Order. And since they did do this, let us, in the next Place, inquire, what Ground there is for supposing, that they had done so by St. *Barnabas*. Now we find, in Acts iv. 36. that St. *Barnabas* was among the Disciples very soon after, if not before, our Saviour's Resurrection; and from the Apostles giving him the Name of *Barnabas*, which is, being interpreted, the Son of Consolation, or of Exhortation (a), it is not improbable, that he was employed by them in the Ministry. The next Place we read of him is in the eleventh Chapter, upon account of his being sent by the Apostles to *Antioch*, when they had heard, that many in that City were turned to the Lord upon the preaching of those who had been dispersed upon the Persecution that arose about *Stephen*, as they had before sent *Peter* and *John*, upon the same Occasion, to *Samaria*. From whence, I hope, it may not be unreasonably presumed, that, if they thought it necessary to send *Peter* and *John*, Apostles of their own Rank, to *Samaria*, it is not likely, that they would have sent one of an inferior Authority, upon the same Business, to such a City as *Antioch*. Though the Arguments in Favour of St. *Barnabas's* Apostleship before this, are, it must be confessed, only presumptive; yet, I hope, they will be allowed to carry so much Weight with them, as to convince us,

that

(a) Vid. Beza in Locum.

that the contrary Opinion should not be taken for granted, but ought to be proved, before any Consequence drawn from it, should be looked upon as either just or valid. But that no Ordination was really intended in this Place, may be moreover confirmed, from what the Holy Ghost commanded those Prophets and Teachers to do, when he said, *separate me Barnabas and Saul for the Work whereunto I have called them*: He did not say, separate them for the Ministry in general, but for that particular Work, whereunto he had then called them; and if we attend them in this their Mission only throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth Chapters, we shall find, that this particular Work, whereunto they had been appointed, was to preach the Gospel to the *Gentiles*; which was a Point of Doctrine the Disciples, who had been chiefly converted from the *Jews*, do not seem to have been acquainted with, till God was pleased to reveal it expressly in a Vision to St. Peter in *Judea* (a); and here again to the *Jewish* Disciples at *Antioch*: And the Design of the Holy Ghost, in ordering those Prophets and Teachers to separate *Barnabas* and *Saul* to this Work, seems to be this, that it might appear, if ever they should be called in Question for it, as St. Peter had been for going unto *Cornelius* (b), that they went out with the free Consent and Concurrence of that Church, and that too by the immediate Appointment of the Holy Ghost, and not schismatically upon their own Heads. These are the Reasons I had to offer, why this could have been no Ordination to *Paul* and *Barnabas*. Let us now proceed to inquire,

In

(a) Acts 10.

(b) Ibid. 11.

In the second Place, what Grounds there are for believing that those Prophets and Teachers were not of an Order inferiour to that of the Apostles. In the first Verse of the thirteenth Chapter it is written : *Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch, certain Prophets and Teachers ; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrenè, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul.* Here we find that *Barnabas* and *Saul*, who was afterwards better known by the Name of *Paul*, were reckoned as being also Part of those Prophets and Teachers ; one of whom, *St. Paul*, I hope, has been already proved to have been, at that very Time, indisputably an Apostle ; and also, there have been very strong Presumptions given that *Barnabas* was one also. Now if *Barnabas* and *Saul*, though Apostles, were called also Prophets and Teachers, then the Reasons for believing those others, who were called so likewise, to have been also of apostolical Authority, must be allowed to be, at least, equally as strong as those for supposing them not to have been of it ; and therefore, no Consequence ought regularly to be admitted from hence in Favour of Ordination by Presbyters rather than by Bishops ; but if it has been clearly made appear, that no Ordination was intended in this Place, then can no Sort of Authority be drawn, from this Transaction, in Favour of Ordination by Presbyters at all.

But furthermore, to prove that Presbyters did actually ordain, you tell us in the same Page, that “ it is a well known, acknowledged, incontestible Fact, that Presbyters, in the celebrated

“ lebrated Church of *Alexandria*, ordained even
 “ their own Bishops, for more than two hun-
 “ dred Years, in the earliest Ages of Christia-
 “ nity.” Now admitting this to be true; yet,
 ought the Practice of that particular Church to
 be set against the concurrent one of all other
 Churches? But that Presbyters, in the Church
 of *Alexandria*, did ever ordain their own Bishops,
 is, I believe, very far from being either *a well*
known, acknowledged, or incontestible Fact. For,
 if I am not mistaken, it depends solely upon
 the Authority of St. *Jerome*, very much misre-
 presented. He indeed, in his 85th Epistle, which
 seems to have been writ in one continued Fit
 of Passion, against some one who had given the
 Preference to Deacons before Priests, speaks in
 such high Terms of Priests, that he puts them
 almost upon a level with Bishops. But had he
 said, in express Words, that Presbyters in the
 Church of *Alexandria* did formerly *ordain* their
 own Bishops (which is what he never once does)
 yet would it not have been the only Time his
 vehement Manner of writing had betrayed him
 into Inconsistencies: For, writing against *Hel-*
vidius, he took Occasion to commend Virginity,
 in such high Strains, that he was suspected by
 some to have condemned Marriage; for which
 he thought himself obliged to make an Apo-
 logy, and to soften the Terms he had made
 use of.

But after all, What is it that *Jerome* has said
 upon this Occasion? Why that, in the Church
 of *Alexandria*, the Presbyters, having elected one
 out of their own Order, and having placed him
 on a higher Seat, (with Intent probably that he
 might be seen the better by the People) nomi-
 nated

ated him Bishop. *Presbyteri unum ex se electum in excelsiori Gradu Collocatum, Episcopum nominabant.* But does he say, that, by this Election, he was consecrated or ordained? Not at all. For a little after, in the very same Epistle, he asks this Question, What is there that a Bishop does, *which a Presbyter might not do, except ordain?* So far was he then from imagining this to have been any Ordination, that he does not allow Presbyters any Authority to ordain at all: Which not only most effectually overthrows what you have been pleased to call *a well known, acknowledged, and incontestible Fact*, viz. that Presbyters in the Church of *Alexandria* did, at the first, *ordain* their own Bishops; but is also such a Testimony against the Ordination by Presbyters, in general, as cannot easily be got over.

But there is one Reason more which you have assigned, why Ordination by Presbyters should be valid, and that is, that “Bishops and Presbyters are in Scripture the very same, or not a distinct Order or Office in the Church.” In Proof of which you have collected together several Authorities from the New Testament, to which you have subjoined the Opinion of some of our first reformed Divines, and some others since, that Bishops had no Superiority to Presbyters (a). That Presbyters were in the Apostles Time called also Bishops is undeniably true; and from the Identity of the Name several of our first reformed Divines, as well as others, might possibly have been misled to look upon those, who have been called Bishops since, to have been the same with those who are called Bishops

(a) 3 Letter, p. 57.

Bishops in the New Testament. But this is an Error I shall now endeavour to remove ; and in order to it, I shall shew, that those who were called Bishops, during the Time the Apostles lived, had not the same Authority with those who are called so at present, but acted under the Direction either of the Apostles themselves, or else of some other Persons of apostolical Authority, placed immediately by the Apostles over them. And secondly, I shall prove that they had not the Power to ordain. From whence it will follow, that though they were called Bishops, yet were they not really what we mean by such at present, but only Presbyters or Priests of the second Order in the Ministry, in our Church.

But first, I am to shew, that those who were called Bishops during the Time the Apostles lived, had not the same Authority with those who are called so at present ; and this appears clearly from St. Paul's Epistles to *Titus* and *Timothy*. For in his Epistle to *Titus*, he tells him, that *he left him in Crete, that he should set in Order the Things that were wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as he had appointed him (a)*. And notwithstanding it is not so expressly said of *Timothy*, that he besought him to abide at *Ephesus* to ordain them Bishops or Elders there; yet, from the particular Description of the Qualifications requisite to be found upon Examination in such Bishops, given him in the third Chapter of his first Epistle, and from his charging him to *lay Hands suddenly on no Man (b)*, it is plainly implied, that *Timothy* must have had this Authority also. But it does not only
appear

(a) Tit. i. 5.

(b) 1 Epist. v. 22.

appear from hence, that both *Titus* and *Timothy* had the Power to ordain these Presbyters or Bishops; but likewise, that they had Authority to inquire into their Conduct and Behaviour in the Ministry: For *St. Paul* tells *Timothy*, that he besought him to abide at *Ephesus*, that he might charge some that they teach no other Doctrine (a); and again, let the Elders that rule well be accounted worthy of double Honour (b); and, against an Elder receive not an Accusation, but before two or three Witnesses (c). *Timothy* and *Titus* therefore (if any ever had) must have had the very same Authority our Bishops now enjoy, though then not distinguished by that Name; whilst others, though at that Time called Bishops, could by no means have had it, being under the Cognizance of those, who had been placed immediately over them by the Apostles, and by whom many of them must have been ordained, as may be confirmed from *St. Paul's* Direction, both to *Timothy* and *Titus*, about the Ordination of such; they not having this Power in themselves. And this is what I am to prove, in the second Place. That those Presbyters, or Bishops, spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles, and some of *St. Paul's* Epistles, had not Authority to ordain, is deducible from *Acts* the 20th, and *St. Paul's* first Epistle to *Timothy*. In *Acts* the 20th we read, that when *St. Paul* had called the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus* to *Miletus*, among other Things, he said to them, take Heed unto yourselves, and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you Overseers. In the Original it is (ἐπισκόπους) Bishops. Hence we find, that there

(a) 1 Tim. i. 3.

(b) *Ibid.* v. 17.(c) *Ibid.* 19.

there were these Bishops at that Time in the Church of *Ephesus*. And from St. *Paul's* telling *Timothy*, that he besought him to abide at *Ephesus*, to charge some, that they teach no other *Doctrine*, it is plainly to be inferred, that there were such Overseers or Bishops there, who had the feeding of the Flock of Christ even then, when St. *Paul* left *Timothy* at that Place. But if these Overseers or Bishops had had Authority to ordain, it is not at all consistent to believe, that St. *Paul* would have left *Timothy* there, only to do what they could as well have done without him; but by doing of it, he has sufficiently signified, that he did not look upon them as having any such Authority belonging to them. These Bishops then could not have had the Power to ordain, and consequently could not have been the same with those we call Bishops at present; but must have been of an Order or Degree in the Ministry inferiour to them. And the Reason, why those, who were only Presbyters, were at that Time called also Bishops, seems to be this: The Name Bishop, formed from a *Greek* Word, which signifies an Overseer, might, with equal Propriety, be given to those, who then had the Care of separate Congregations only committed to them, as to others since, who have had the Oversight over several Congregations collectively; who, though they succeeded the Apostles in their Authority, yet, either through Humility of themselves declining, or else the People refusing to honour them with the high Title of Apostles, as thinking it to belong, in a peculiar Manner, to those who had been sent out immediately by Christ himself, they from thenceforth were called

Bishops,

Bishops, as being in a more general Sense Overseers of the Church of God; whilst those who had been promiscuously named either Presbyters or Bishops, for the avoiding of Confusion, became distinguished by the Name of Presbyter only, which with us has been abreviated into Priest, and which in plain *English* therefore signifies an Elder. If, by what has been said upon this Subject, it has been sufficiently proved, that those Bishops, mentioned in the New Testament, were not of the apostolical or episcopal Order, but of one inferiour to it, in that they acted under the Direction of others, and had not the Power to ordain; then it will follow, not only that no Advantage can be drawn from hence, in Favour of Ordination by Presbyters, but also, that there were three Orders in the Ministry of the Church from the very Beginning: That which *Timothy* and *Titus* were of, by what Name soever at that Time distinguished, together with that of Presbyters, and that of Deacons.

There is one Consideration more upon this Head of Ordination, which you beg leave to mention, the rather, because you think there hath not generally that Stress been laid upon it, which its Importance deserves: That is, “sup-
 “ posing the Power of Ordination to be from
 “ Scripture ever so clearly proved to belong
 “ solely to Bishops; yet, all the Bishops of
 “ this Realm refusing to ordain, but upon un-
 “ justifiable Terms; Ordination, in this Case,
 “ may justly be sought from Presbyters; and
 “ when, given by them, is of undoubted
 “ Validity and Regularity in the Christian
 “ Church

Church (a).¹⁹ I need only put your important Argument into a Syllogism, to shew the Inconclusiveness of it. Now, according to your own Supposition, the Power of Ordination is from Scripture clearly to be proved to belong solely to Bishops: But all the Bishops of this Realm refuse to ordain, but upon unjustifiable Terms; therefore Ordination may justly be sought from Presbyters. Your Minor is denied; and as to your Conclusion, any one, who has but a very slender Knowledge of Logick, must perceive, that it can never follow from your Premises. The more natural one, as well as more logically true, would certainly have been, that therefore Ordination should be sought from such Bishops, as would not insist upon unjustifiable Terms; and not from Presbyters, who, if your Major be true, can have no Authority, either regular or valid, to ordain at all. For if Ordination is from Scripture clearly to be proved to belong solely to Bishops, I should be glad to be informed, by what Authority Ordination conferred by Presbyters can be of *undoubted Validity and Regularity in the Christian Church.*

But why ought Persons, who may have persuaded themselves that they are duely qualified to serve Christ in his Church, if they think the Terms of our Ordination unjustifiable, to seek to be ordained at all? Wherefore is *their Ministry*, as you are pleased to say, *so greatly needed (b)*? What want is there of their Service? When there are others abundantly sufficient in Number; and, it is to be hoped, not unduely qualified, already imployed, and who highly

I approve

(a) 3 Letter, p. 67, 68.

(b) *Ibid.* 68.

approve of the Terms of our Ordination. You tell us, moreover, that *we reject those whom Christ receives* (a). But how does it appear, that Christ receives them? Is it because they have been ordained by Presbyters? If what has been said upon the preceding Parts of this Section has any Weight, it does not appear from Scripture, that Presbyters have any Power to ordain; and consequently, those that have received their Ordination from such only, cannot warrantably be said to be received by Christ as his Ministers.

You say again, "let the sole Power of Ordination then be allowed to have been originally lodged in the Bishops; yet, if, at any Time, they should enter into Combination to abuse or pervert this Power (b)."

Let me stop here, and ask you, How it has ever been made appear, that the Bishops have entered into any such Combination? To say that the Bishops have entered into a Combination to abuse or pervert their Power, if Words have any Meaning, implies that it was an Act of their Will, and not of, but even contrary to, their Judgment; which is so severe a Censure, as ought not rashly to have dropt from the Pen of any one, who professes and calls himself a Christian; and much less, surely, without any Sort of Proof or Provocation, from that of one who may possibly look upon himself as his Minister, *who, when he was reviled, reviled not again*. But you add, "and if Ordination cannot be had from them (meaning the Bishops) upon honourable and Christian Terms; in this we may safely Reason, as our Lord hath taught in a like Case, that God

(a) 3 Letter, p. 68.

(b) *Ibid.*

“ God will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice ;
 “ that a mere Ceremony is to give way to Con-
 “ siderations of a moral Nature.” You are
 here pleased to say, that the Occasion upon
 which our Lord spoke the foregoing Words,
 that *God would have Mercy, and not Sacrifice*,
 was similar to a Person, seeking Orders from
 Elders ; or, as you tell us a little farther, from
 the People, nay even to his *taking this Honour*
to himself, when he thinks the Terms of epif-
 copal Ordination unjustifiable. But possibly,
 upon an impartial Examination, the Occasions
 will be found to be very widely different. Our
 Saviour, according to *St. Matthew*, quotes this
 Passage from *Hosea*, upon two several Occasions ;
 the first was, when the Pharisees were scanda-
 lized at his eating in the House of *Matthew*,
 in Company with Publicans and Sinners ; the
 next was, when they accused his Disciples
 for plucking the Ears of Corn, and eating them
 on the Sabbath Day ; these latter our Saviour ex-
 cuses by the Example of *David's* eating the
 shew Bread ; proving thereby, that a positive
 Institution, even of God himself, might, upon
 some Occasions, excusably be made to give way
 to the Necessities of Mankind ; and shews it,
 moreover, to be agreeable to his Will, who had
 declared, that *he would have Mercy, and not*
sacrifice ; and with Regard to his own Con-
 duct, he lets them know, that he conversed
 with Publicans and Sinners, upon the same De-
 sign, as a Physician with his Patients ; and jus-
 tifies his so doing, by observing likewise, that
 God would have Mercy rather than sacrifice.
 But where now is the Similitude between our
 Saviour's Practice in this Case and yours ? Here

were Publicans and Sinners most superstitiously avoided by the Pharisees, and by that means precluded, at least, from one effectual Method of coming to a better Knowledge of themselves and their Duty to God; which they might have had from the Conversation of those, who affected to be looked upon not only as more holy, but also more perfectly instructed in their Law, than other Men. These therefore our Saviour graciously associates himself with, in order to their Amendment, whose coming, he told them, was to call such to Repentance. Now, in what he here did, he did not invade any one Branch of the *Jewish* sacerdotal Office; but you, on the contrary, assert it to be lawful for any Person, who shall think himself duely qualified, to do what is not left undone; to thrust himself into what is the peculiar Province of others, who may, without offence, I hope, be looked upon as duely qualified as he. Was there not a regular Ministry in the Church of *England*; Were not the Sacraments duely administered; Were not the People assembled every Sabbath Day, to join in the Service of God, and to hear the Scriptures read and expounded to them, and all in their vulgar Tongue, before your Separation? And do not the same Things continue to be performed still? What is there similar between our Saviour's most mercifully conversing with those, who had been most uncharitably deserted entirely, and your taking upon you to gather separate Congregations out of those, of whom there was as proper Care taken as you can shew? Has there any absurd, dangerous, or heterodox Doctrine been maintained in the Church of *England*, since the Reformation? What Things, useful or necessary to their Salvation,

vation, are the People taught in your Meetings, which they might not have learned in our Churches? And hence, moreover, if the Disciples of our Lord did, as *David* had done before them, in a Case of Necessity, act inconsistently with a positive Institution of God, what necessity can you plead for doing as you do; for doing what, if your own Supposition be right, that the Power of Ordination is from Scripture clearly to be proved to belong solely to Bishops, must be both unscriptural and irregular? But the Inference you make from our Saviour's saying *that God would have Mercy and not sacrifice*, that a mere Ceremony is to give way to Considerations of a moral Nature, is somewhat extraordinary. For why a mere Ceremony? What, are the legal Institutions of the *Jews*, and the Observation of the Sabbath then mere Ceremonies with you? Those legal Institutions, however indifferent in their own Nature, yet, being instituted by God himself, became to the *Jews* an indispensable Part of their Worship; and therefore must certainly have been more than mere Ceremonies. The setting apart one Day in seven for religious Services, being appointed by God himself, and incorporated by him among Duties of a moral Obligation, must be looked on as such also, and consequently still more than a mere Ceremony. And, for the same Reason, since the Apostles themselves did ordain, who were divinely inspired, and had been instructed by our Lord himself, after his Resurrection, for forty Days together, in *the Things pertaining to the Kingdom of God*; as *Moses* had been for the same Number of Days in the Mount, concerning the Service of the

Tabernacle; and since they impowered those to do it likewise, who were to succeed them in the spiritual Government of the Church; Ordination by Bishops, who are their Successors in this Authority, ought not to be esteemed as a mere Ceremony. That the Apostles did themselves ordain is evident, from their having done it by the seven Deacons, and from the Practice of *St. Paul* and *Barnabas*, who ordained *Elders* in every Church in that Mission, to which the Holy Ghost had, in a special Manner, called them, and that they conferred the Power of it upon those whom they appointed to succeed them, is clearly to be collected from *St. Paul's* Epistle to *Titus* and his first to *Timothy*.

But, moreover, from the same Premises you likewise conclude, "that Men, in other Respects, well qualified, when their Service is needed in the Church (of which themselves, and People are to be judges) may act as Ministers in the Church of Christ; either without any Ordination, when it cannot honourably be had; or with such only, whether Presbyterian or Popular, as can be had upon honourable Terms." Upon which I shall bestow an Observation or two, wherewith I shall conclude my Remarks upon this Section.

That Men, in other Respects well qualified, and the People are to be judges, whether their Service is needed in the Church or not, is a Principle which, if true, must necessarily tend to crumble every Church to Atoms. For if it be justifiable for every Man, who has a good Opinion of himself, and who takes it into his Head to dislike the Method, in which the Service is performed, and the Sacraments administered,

stered, by the present Pastor in any Congregation, and can by any Means draw over a good Part of the People to his way of Thinking, and prevail upon them to ordain him their Teacher, (which might be no very difficult Matter to do, considering the Capriciousness, generally speaking, of the human Mind) I say, were it justifiable for any Person, upon such Pretences, to take upon him to act as a Minister of the Christian Church, it would be morally impossible for any Congregation to keep itself together for any considerable Time, but would be continually liable to be divided and subdivided without End; which, I make no doubt, would be soon perceived, were this Principle but once thoroughly established among the People, and permitted to work with its full Force in your own Congregations. But there is yet a Consequence, of a far more dangerous Nature, than that of introducing Anarchy and Confusion into the Church, by the Division and Subdivision of it, which flows from what you have advanced; I mean, that a Way is opened, almost without any Possibility of Prevention, for Persons, who are fallen into the most fundamental Errors, to become Teachers and Preachers in many, and I might add in most, Congregations. For you say, that Men, in other Respects, well qualified, and the People, are to be judges, whether their Service be needed in the Church. But then, who are to judge, whether those Men, who may think themselves well qualified for the Christian Ministry, are really so or not? If you say, the People; give me leave to observe to you, upon what account they ought to be looked upon very improper Judges, in a Matter of such

I 4

Consequence

Consequence as this. The People, generally speaking, are apt to form their Judgment of Persons from their outward Appearance only, either not duely concerning themselves about, or else not being capable to discover the secret Perversion of, their Hearts; and was a Person tainted with the pernicious Principles of some of the ancient Hereticks, yet practised their Austerities, nay, was an Arian, a Socinian, or even a Papist, who had Art enough to disguise their Opinions, and to behave as outwardly sober and virtuous Men, to be put in Competition with such as were truly Orthodox in their Principles, and also truly pious and Christian in their Lives, upon your System, they would have, at least, an equal Chance with them, for being chosen Ministers in several Congregations. You will say, perhaps, that the People, when they find that they have been deceived in them, may dismiss them. Well, be it so. But suppose (and which may not be a groundless Supposition) that they, by their secret Practises, had perverted the major Part of their Congregations before the Discovery has been made; Who is to dismiss them then? But admitting that they may have perverted only a few; yet surely the Perversion even of one ought by all means to be guarded against; yet, I hope, by this Time, appears not to be effectually done by your Plan. But if you mean, that Persons themselves are to judge of their own Qualifications for the Ministry, they may be found likewise to be very improper judges, in Cases wherein they are themselves so nearly concerned. Men may generally be observed to entertain too favourable an Opinion of their own Parts; and self-sufficiency

ciency and pride of Heart entered very deeply into the Constitution of many of the Heresiarchs ; and possibly Mankind may not be so much altered for the better, as to give us any Reason to apprehend that the same Cause should not produce the same Effect still ; that Men may be very Heterodox in their ways of Thinking, and yet have no worse Opinion of themselves upon that Account : Wherefore, Persons themselves ought not to be allowed to be proper Judges whether they are duely qualified for the Ministry or not. These are some of the Exceptions, which, this your Position, that Men in other Respects well qualified, &c. seems to be liable to from Reason. I shall now lay before you some Considerations, upon which it appears to be inconsistent also with Scripture. In the Gospel we read, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Author of the Christian Covenant, and whom St. Paul, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, has proved to have been that Person, who was to be *a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedek*, did out of a Number of Disciples chuse twelve, eleven of whom (one of them *Judas Iscariot* being lost) he, a little before his Ascension, indued with a very extraordinary Power, when *he breathed on them, and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever Sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever Sins ye retain they are retained* (a) ; and gave them Orders to go and *preach the Gospel to all Nations, and to baptize such as received it, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost* (b). From his choosing thus twelve Disciples only out of a Number

(a) John xx. 22, 23.

(b) Matt. xxviii. 19.

a Number of others (a), and giving them such a singular Power and Commission, assuring them, at the same Time, that, in the Execution of it, he would be with them *always, even to the End of the World* (b); he has plainly signified, that the Business in which they were employed, was peculiar to those who should in a proper Manner be set apart for it; and that it was not to be left open either for the People to ordain unto, or for every one to engage himself in at his own Discretion.

Though I thought that I had herewith finished my Remarks upon this Section, yet, upon a Review I find, at the Bottom of the sixtieth Page, a Quotation, with a Note upon it, overlooked by me before; which I shall take Notice of here, that I may be able to say, I have not wittingly passed over any Thing which seemed to me to merit Regard. The Quotation is made from the Office for ordaining Deacons, where the Bishop asks — “ Do you think that you are truly called according to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due Order of this Realm;” upon which you say, “ *Note*, It is not sufficient to make him a Minister of this Church, that he is called according to the Will or Institution of Jesus Christ, if he be not also called according to the due Order of this Realm.” But this Question relates only to the external Call to the Ministry, the Bishop having examined them concerning their internal one in the Question immediately preceding; and consequently all that is intended by this, is to know from their own Mouths, whether the Persons to be

(a) Luke vi. 13.

(b) Matt. xxviii. 20.

be ordained do think that the Order; they are going to be admitted to, is according to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ; and also, whether the Form or Manner of Admission to it used in this Realm or Church be truly valid.

Thus, Sir, I have considered the several Arguments alledged by you, with Design to give us *more just and favourable Impressions of Ordination by Presbyters*. And whether, after what has been said upon them, we ought to *sink our Esteem of Episcopal*, or you yours of Presbyterian, Ordination, I shall recommend to your own more serious Consideration; and go on to your next Section, which is,

Of the People's Right to chuse their own Pastors.

In support of which you argue, that from the Charge given them in Scripture, *to try the Spirits—to beware of false Prophets—to take heed what they hear*, they had a Right of Judging; from whence you infer, that they had a Right also of chusing their own Pastors. But possibly, upon an impartial Examination, your Conclusion will be found too general for your Principles. Our Saviour bids his Disciples *beware of false Prophets* (a); and St. John cautions those, to whom he wrote his first Epistle, *not to believe every Spirit, but to try the Spirits, whether they are of God; because many false Prophets were gone out into the World* (b). Hence we may perceive, that both the Charges are particular, being no other than that of being aware of false Prophets; for which Reason the Conclusion drawn from them ought to be so likewise; and which can regularly

(a) Matt. vii. 15. (b) 1. Epist. iv. 1. M. (c)

regularly be, only, that the People were at Liberty to chuse, whether they would be seduced by such false Prophets as should arise or not; and not that they had, in general, a Right to chuse their own Pastors. But our Saviour's ordering his Disciples to *take heed what they hear* (a), can be nothing to your Purpose: For it has no Sort of Reference, either to judging or chusing; for he had not been speaking of a Diversity of Doctrines, but had, in his foregoing Parable of the Sower, been shewing, that the generality of Men would be such negligent Hearers of the true, as to profit little or nothing by it; Whence he takes Occasion to charge his Disciples, to give such diligent Attention to those Things which had been spoken to them by him, that they might not be like those unfruitful Hearers alluded to in that Parable.

But to proceed. The same may be observed upon your next Text, Rom. xvi. 17. as has been done upon your two former; that, from a particular Caution, you have drawn likewise a general Conclusion. For though the Christian Laity are therein charged to mark them that cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which they had learned; and to avoid them; (which is what I most sincerely wish they always had done; for then, perhaps, you and I should not have had any Occasion to have troubled the Publick with our different Opinions upon these Particulars) I say, though they be charged to mark, (*σκοπεῖν* to consider, to observe ever so carefully) yet it is only them who cause Divisions; which is what they surely might have been cautioned to do, without their being supposed

(a) Mark iv. 24. See Beza's Annot. & Dr. Clark's Par.

supposed to have had a Right to chuse their own Pastors. For suppose the Bishops of this Church, upon the starting up of any new-fangled Teachers, should write pastoral Letters to the People of their respective Dioceses, wherein they took Occasion to caution them to try the Spirits of such Men—to beware of such false Teachers; Would it not be a very extraordinary Way of Reasoning, should a Stranger to our ecclesiastical Constitution infer from thence, that the People of this Church had a Right to chuse their own Pastors? *Moses*, in the Beginning of the thirteenth and the latter End of the eighteenth Chapters of *Deuteronomy*, warns the People of *Israel* against false and presumptuous Prophets; giving them Signs, whereby they were to be discovered; from whence they must have had a Right of judging: But whoever thought of inferring from thence, that they had also a Right to chuse their own Priests? And yet this is what might, with full as good Propriety, be done, as, from our Saviour's ordering his Disciples to beware of false Prophets, to conclude, that the Christian Laity had a Right to chuse their own Ministers. Upon the whole, so little Connexion does there seem to be between your Conclusion and the Authorities it is deduced from, that I cannot help thinking, a common and unbyassed Reader might have read them over a thousand Times, without so much as ever once imagining, that they had any such Consequence belonging to them.

In the next Place, you would support your Argument from the Manner in which the Place of *Judas* the Traitor was filled up, *Acts* i. and
in

in which the seven Deacons were chosen, Acts vi. which you say, “ plainly shews it to be the
 “ Constitution of the great *Founder* of the
 “ Christian Church, that its Ministers should
 “ be appointed by *the Election of the People.*”
 With regard to the filling up the Place of *Judas*
 you argue, that “ an Apostle was an Officer
 “ of extraordinary Rank, whom it seemed, in
 “ a peculiar Manner, the Prerogative of Christ
 “ to appoint solely to that Office; but neither
 “ doth he do this, nor yet order the *apostolic*
 “ College to fill up this Vacancy by their own
 “ Authority and Discretion; but (for an In-
 “ struction, no doubt, to future Ages) he com-
 “ manded the *Christian People* (the whole Num-
 “ ber of Believers, as far as appears, that were
 “ then at *Jerusalem*) to *chuse out* two, and pre-
 “ sent them before him, of whom he would
 “ appoint one to the vacant Apostolate.” In
 what you have here advanced, there are some
 few Points that do not appear to be so very
 certain as you have taken them to be. You say,
 that the hundred and twenty, assembled upon
 this Occasion, *were the whole Number of Be-*
lievers, as far as appears, that were then at Je-
rusalem; but upon a stricter Inquiry, the Pro-
 bability, that there were many more Disciples
 then at *Jerusalem* than those hundred and twenty,
 may possibly be found equally as strong, if not
 much stronger, than that they were the whole
 Number; which must greatly weaken your Hy-
 pothesis, that does, in great Measure, depend
 upon this Assembly’s being composed of the
 whole Number of Believers then in that City.
 Now St. *Paul* informs us, 1 Cor. xv. 6. that
 our Saviour was seen of above five hundred
 Brethren

Brethren at once, after his Resurrection, who must have been made Disciples even during the Course of his Ministry ; and from what St. *John* writes in his Gospel, it is clearly to be deduced, that our Saviour must have had a very considerable Number of Disciples ; for in the third Chapter, and twenty sixth Verse, he introduces the Disciples of St. *John* the Baptist, as telling him, that *he that was with him beyond Jordan, and to whom he bore Witness, baptized, and all Men came to him ;* and in the Beginning of the very next Chapter, we are given to understand, that the Number of them was so great, that the Pharisees began to take Umbrage at it ; for we read there, that *when the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John, he left Judea, and departed again into Galilee :* From all which Places together it appears plainly, that the Multitude of our Saviour's Disciples was very considerable, and that, from the last in particular, even in *Judea* itself, that is, in the Country round about *Jerusalem*, before his Crucifixion. I shall now proceed to consider what Probability there is, that there was then in *Jerusalem*, when this Assembly was held, a far greater Number of them than that hundred and twenty, of whom it is said to be composed. St. *Luke*, Acts i. 15. speaking of the Time when that Meeting of the Disciples was, says, it was *in those Days*, that is, in the Days that intervened between our Saviour's Ascension and the Feast of Pentecost, which could not be above nine. However, he has left it quite undetermined upon which of those Days it was ; yet, from his Manner of expressing himself,

self, we may justly suppose, that two or three Days at least had passed, after our Saviour's Ascension, before this Assembly met; and if so, then we may very reasonably conclude, that an Event of such Consequence, as that of our Saviour's Ascension, would quickly be spread, not only among the Disciples at *Jerusalem*, but also at Places some Distance from it; so that, in two or three Days Time, we may very naturally believe, a great many would come up to *Jerusalem* to the Apostles, who were ordered not to depart from thence (a), to be satisfied of the Truth and Circumstances of so interesting a Fact. But if we were to suppose (and I can see no Inconsistency in supposing) this Meeting of the Disciples to have been not long before the Feast of Pentecost, we should then have much stronger Reason still for believing, that there was a far greater Number there; because many might possibly have come up, in order to prepare for keeping that Feast, the same with their Feast of Weeks, one of the three solemn Times in the Year, when all the Males were to appear before the Lord, in the Place which he should chuse (b), which was then *Jerusalem*. All these Circumstances considered, it must be allowed to be equally as probable, that those hundred and twenty were not the whole Number of Believers then at *Jerusalem*, as that they were; and if so, then all that you have built, upon supposing them to be the whole, must fall to the Ground.

But there are some Reasons for believing (and which I shall now lay before you) that the People had no Concern at all in this Business.

St.

(a) Acts i. 4.

(b) Deut. xvi. 16.

St. *Luke* acquaints us, that our Saviour appointed seventy Disciples besides the twelve, and sent them, two by two, before his Face, whither he himself would come (*a*). If we compare what he said to these seventy, with what he had before done upon the same Occasion to the twelve (*b*), we shall find, that the Power and Authority of both were then the same. And if we add these seventy to the eleven, which remained after the Death of *Judas* the Traitor, there will be eighty one Persons, it may be still surviving, who had been employed by Christ in the Ministry. And that he did occasionally Commission also others to the same Business, is clear from the 59th and 60th Verses of the ninth Chapter, where it is written, and he said to another, follow me; but he said, Lord suffer me first to go and bury my Father; Jesus saith unto him, let the Dead bury their Dead, but go thou and preach the Kingdom of God (*c*).

And

(*a*) *Luke* x. i. &c. (*b*) *Ibid.* ix. 1. &c.

(*c*) Our Saviour, in this Place, is supposed to have referred to the 6th Chapter of Numbers, and the 21st of Leviticus. See Dr. *Mill's* Refer. upon this Text. The 6th of Numbers contains the Laws for the *Nazarites*, who, during the Time the Vow was upon them, were not to approach to any dead Body, nor to make themselves unclean for Father or for Mother, or for any other near Relation. And in the 21st of Leviticus are set down Directions for the high Priest, who likewise was not to go in to any dead Body, nor to defile himself for his Father or for his Mother. Now if our Saviour had indeed these Texts in view, as it is not improbable but what he had, then we may presume, that he did Design what he has here said as a tacit Intimation, that he would have all those, who had been commissioned immediately by himself to preach the Gospel, look upon themselves as in an especial Manner separated and holy unto the Lord. And moreover, likewise, that they should be

And there is very great Reason to believe, that he, who commanded his Disciples to pray the Lord of the Harvest, that he would send forth Labourers into his Harvest (a), would himself take every Opportunity of sending such, when he found any duely disposed for it. Wherefore, all Things considered, those hundred and twenty, whereof the Assembly of Disciples, spoken of in the first Chapter of the Acts, is said to have consisted, may be supposed to suit rather with the Number of those who had been commissioned by Christ to preach the Gospel, than to that of all the Disciples which were then at *Jerusalem*. If then, from what has been said, it appears probable, that there were more Disciples than the hundred and twenty at *Jerusalem*, when *St. Matthias* was appointed to the Apostolate; and also, that not all the Believers, but those only, who had been employed by our Saviour in the Ministry, were assembled upon that Occasion; then must the Manner, in which the Place of *Judas* the Traitor was filled up, be so far from being a strong presumptive Evidence, in support of popular Elections, that it can afford no Evidence in Favour of it at all.

Neither yet does the Manner, in which the seven Deacons were chosen, Acts vi. *shew it plainly to be the Constitution of the great Founder of the Christian Church, that its Ministers should be appointed by the Election of the People.* For

there be regarded by others, as upon an Equality with the high Priest of the *Jews*: For to the other Priests, it was permitted to defile themselves for a Father, or for a Mother, and other near Relations, mentioned in the Beginning of the same Chapter.

(a) Matt. ix. 38.

there are very good Grounds for believing, that it was never designed for a standing Rule always to be observed, but that the Apostles only submitted to it then in Compliance with the present Necessity. Upon the Complaint of the Hellenistical Jews, *that their Widows were neglected in the daily Ministration*, the Apostles found it necessary to institute the Office of Deacons, to assist them in distributing what had been collected for the Use of the Poor, that they themselves might not be diverted from Business of more weighty Concern ; and the present Occasion requiring that it should be done immediately, but they not having Leisure, from their other Employments, to look out themselves, and probably not sufficient Knowledge of the Lives and Characters of a proper Number of Persons to be appointed to that Business, did desire the People for that Occasion (as imagining that they, from a personal Knowledge, might be better acquainted with the Characters of each other than they themselves then were) *to look out seven Men of honest Report, full of the Holy Ghost and Wisdom* : I say, for that Occasion ; because afterwards, when they themselves had had Time and Opportunity to become better acquainted with the Disciples ; they, from what may be collected to have been their subsequent Practice, do not seem to have paid that Deference to the Voice of the People, as to think it necessary, or even expedient, to the ordaining a Person to any Function in the Church : For St. Paul, who was also an Apostle, and who we cannot imagine would causelessly have departed from the Custom and Usage of the other Apostles ; especially, had he been per-

suaded, that they were such as had been appointed by God himself; as you tell us, the Right of the People to chuse the Ministers of the Church was (a); in the third Chapter of his first Epistle to *Timothy*, after having given him express Directions, how such as were to be admitted to the Office of Deacons ought to be qualified, both as to their Life and Doctrine, does not once order him to take Care, that they had been first duely elected by the People; but only adds, in the tenth Verse, *and let those be first proved; then let them use the Office of a Deacon, being found blameless.* Now the Person, who was to prove such as offered themselves Candidates for the Office of a Deacon, could be no other than *Timothy* himself, to whom, in particular, the Apostle addresses these Directions: But if *Timothy* was directed by *St. Paul* (who, no doubt, acted conformably to the rest of the Apostles) to ordain such Persons Deacons, whom he had himself proved, and, by his own Experience, found to be irreproachable, both in Life and Doctrine, and this without their being elected by the People, it may very reasonably be presumed, that neither *St. Paul*, nor the other Apostles, were persuaded that it was the Constitution of Christ, that the Ministers of his Church should be appointed by the Election of the People; and consequently, the Concern the People had in the Choice of the seven Deacons, ought to be looked upon as a Testimony only occasionally required of them, that they were Men of honest Report, full of the Holy Ghost and Wisdom.

But

(a) 2 Letter, p. 55.

But the two Precedents, which you have given from the old Testament, to corroborate your Arguments in Defence of the Peoples Right to chuse their own Pastors, viz. " that when
 " Judges and Rulers were to be appointed over
 " the *Hebrew Tribes*; *Moses*, though possessed
 " of so extraordinary a Measure of both Wis-
 " dom and Authority, pretends not to appoint
 " them merely of his own Will, but leaves
 " them to the People's Choice, Deut. i. 13.
 " *Take ye wise Men and Understanding among*
 " *your Tribes: And I will make them Rulers.*
 " Yea, God himself did not think fit to be-
 " come the peculiar King and Governor of this
 " People, but by their free Election and Choice,
 " Exod. xix. 8. (a); " If they prove any Thing,
 it is what is quite foreign to your Purpose. You were to shew, that the Christian Laity had, by the Appointment of God, a Right to chuse their own Pastors; but from these Instances it is to be inferred, that the Choice of all subordinate civil Officers, as well as of the supreme civil Governors, was by the Will of God left to the People; for those, whom the People were ordered by *Moses* to take, were undeniably designed for subordinate civil Officers, being such as were to be Captains or Rulers over Thousands, over Hundreds, over Fifties, and over Tens (b). And if you have truly represented, what you tell us from Exod. xix. 8. that " God himself did not think fit to become
 " the peculiar King and Governor of that Peo-
 " ple, but by their free Election and Choice,"
 it will follow, that it must have appeared more

K 3

agreeable

(a) 2 Letter, p. 72.
 Exod. xviii. 25.

(b) Deut. i. 13, 15.

agreeable to the Will of God, that the People should chuse also their supreme civil Governors: I say, if you have truly represented this last Instance; because you seem to me to have been greatly mistaken in it; for the Reader need only be desired to turn to Exodus xix. to be satisfied, that God was not proposing himself to them in that Place, to be chosen by them for their King, but is transacting with them as their God; because what he has said to them, upon that Occasion, is no more than what every Person, to whom he has been pleased to manifest his Will, may also very safely apply to himself, that if he will but sincerely obey his Voice, he shall be peculiarly favoured by him. However, admitting it to be as you say, that *God himself did not think fit to become the peculiar King and Governor of the Israelites, but by their free Election and Choice*; yet what Reason is there for imagining, that all People, to whom the revealed Will of God is made known, ought to conform themselves, in every particular Circumstance, to the Plan of his Dealing with that People? But wherefore are we to be told, what was done in the civil, and not rather in the ecclesiastical State of the *Jews*; when you were speaking of the Christian Church; between which and the *Jewish*, it might have been expected that some Conformity would have been observed? There, though by the two foregoing Instances you would make it appear, that popular Elections were more agreeable to the Will of God, you would have found it quite otherwise; because, in that Church, he had fixed and established the Priesthood in such a Manner,

Manner, as not to leave the People even the Shadow of a Right to chuse their own Priests.

In the next Place, to these Authorities from Scripture you subjoin the Opinion of some primitive Fathers, and the Practice of some ancient Churches, in Proof of the Peoples Right to chuse their own Bishops; and then declare yourself surprized at Mr. *White's* contesting so stiffly this Point, when the Stream beats so violently against him (a). But you have not been pleased to let us know in what Part of his Writings you found him contesting so stiffly this Point. However, in that Place you must have had in view, he does not seem so very positive as you have represented him, where he says, " I know nobody that pretends, that the
 " Presence and Approbation of the People was
 " not admitted or required at the Advance-
 " ment of a Bishop : And if it were granted,
 " that, in some Times or Places, their Suf-
 " frage or Vote has been admitted, What does
 " that shew, but that the Practice of the Church,
 " in this Respect, was various ? And what fol-
 " lows from this, but that there was then, no
 " Notion of any *natural* and *unalienable* Right
 " in the People to have Pastors of their own
 " chusing."

What makes this Testimony of St. *Jerome's* the more to our Purpose is, because he was Writing against some, who were for setting the Order of Deacons above that of Presbyters. But to prove the Superiority of Presbyters, he instances the celebrated Church of *Alexandria*; wherein, from St. *Mark* the first Founder for the two succeeding Centuries, the Bishop had
 K 4 been

(a) 3 Letter, p. 72.

been always chose by the Presbyters alone, and that out of their own Order; without the Suffrage or Concurrence of the Deacons: But if the Suffrage of the Deacons was not admitted, we may, I hope, very reasonably infer, neither was that of the People.

And that this is all he contends for, may be seen from what he says, when he first enters upon this Question, where he observes, "that the
 " Presbyterians have not been always in the
 " Sentiments they now profess about this Mat-
 " ter;" and shews, "that, in their *jus divinum*
 " *Ministerii Evangelici*, this Position is laid
 " down, *that the Election of a Minister does not*
 " *belong by divine Right wholly and solely, to the*
 " *major Part of every particular Congregation (a).*"
 And he moreover observes, that "the Inde-
 " pendants, when they came into Power, did
 " not abolish Patronages, and restore the Peo-
 " ple to their pretended Right to chuse their
 " own Pastors (b)." This was not Writing
 like one who was *contesting stiffly*, that the Peo-
 ple were never allowed a Voice in chusing their
 own Bishops; but rather like one that was
 proving, that their Right for so doing was not
 by divine Appointment. And this is what your
 several Instances do not really amount to the
 Proof of: For though there might have been
 some Churches, wherein the Suffrage of the
 People was admitted in the Choice of their
 Bishops, yet, would it not follow, that there
 were not others, in which this Liberty was not
 allowed them. St. Paul left *Timothy* at *Ephe-*
sus, and *Titus* at *Crete* (who had episcopal Au-
 thority if any ever had) without the Con-
 concurrence,

(a) 2 Defence, p. 60.

(b) 2 Letter, p. 141.

currence, or, as far as appears, without even the Request of the People : Now had this their Right to chuse their own Bishops been appointed by God, it is not to be supposed, that *St. Paul*, divinely inspired as he was, would have been guilty of so manifest an Infraction of it. *St. Jerome* tells us, that, in the Church of *Alexandria*, from *St. Mark* the Evangelist, for the two succeeding Centuries, the Bishops were chosen by the Presbyters, without any Mention of the People (a). And to come nearer our own Times, In the Reign of King *James I.* the Presbyterian Ministers, in *Edenborough*, lived together in one large House, preaching in common, without Consideration of particular Charges (b); which is what they surely would never have done, had they been persuaded that each Congregation had, by divine Appointment, a Right to chuse their respective Pastors. From what has been said, it incontestibly appears, that the Practice of Churches, in this particular, was different : And what follows from thence is, that there was no Apprehension of being divinely ordered, that the People should chuse their own Ministers; and for that Reason they did not all alike strictly conform unto it.

As to what *Mr. White* has said further upon this Head, you tell him, that *his Reasoning is truly extraordinary*; which you say, in short, to be this — “ A Man does well, who meekly
 “ attends the Ministry of a good, able, ortho-
 “ dox Minister, by whomsoever provided; but
 “ the King, Bishops, Lord Chancellor, Gentry,
 “ &c. are more competent Judges of the Good-
 “ ness

(a) Letter, p. 85.
 P. 356, 357.

(b) *Heylin's Hist. of Presb.*

“ness and Orthodoxy of Clergymen, than the
 “common People; from whence you conclude,
 “that the People ought not to judge for them-
 “selves in these Matters, but to submit meekly
 “to the Determination of the King, Lord
 “Chancellor, Bishops, &c. (a).” Mr. *White*
 has argued very judiciously in Support of the
 minor Proposition (b): And, I believe, it will
 readily be granted, that he had very good Reason
 for maintaining Persons of a higher Rank,
 and of a liberal and ingenuous Education, to
 be more competent Judges of the Goodness and
 Orthodoxy of Clergymen, than the common
 People. And this is what I cannot perceive,
 that you have denied. The whole Force there-
 fore of your Conclusion, must depend upon
 what he had advanced in his Major, which is,
 that *a Man does well who meekly attends the Mi-
 nistry of a good, able, orthodox Minister, by whom-
 soever provided*; from whence you have drawn
 this Conclusion, *Therefore the People ought not
 to judge for themselves in these Matters, but meekly
 to submit to the Determination of the King, Lord
 Chancellor, Bishops, &c.* But this is a Conclu-
 sion, which can in no wise be justly deduced
 from Mr. *White*’s Proposition: Because, there
 certainly is a very material Difference between
 saying, a Man *does well* in doing a Thing, and
 that he *ought* to do it; there being several Of-
 fices of Life, which a Person may very pro-
 perly be said to do very well in doing, though
 there be no Sort of Obligation upon him for it.
 Neither yet is such a Submission at all required
 of the People in our Church: And this is evi-
 dent from hence; because, in the first Place,
 the

(a) 3 Letter, p. 75.

(b) 2 Letter, p. 9, 10.

the greatest Caution is used in it, with regard both to the Doctrine and Morals of those who come for holy Orders, before they are admitted to them; the same is again repeated, before they can get Institution to any Benefice with Cure of Souls. Let then a Person be presented to a Living by the King, Lord Chancellor, Bishops, or whomsoever else; yet, if he be not truly Orthodox, and brings not proper Testimonials of his good Behaviour, he cannot gain Admittance to it. Hence we see, that all proper Care is taken concerning the Orthodoxy and Worthiness of those who are admitted to parochial Cures. So that it is not left to Patrons to determine *what is Orthodox or not*; neither is it expected from the People, to *submit meekly* to what they determine in these Matters, supposing they should take upon them to do it. But secondly, if, notwithstanding this Precaution, any heterodox and unworthy Minister should find Means of getting in (as no human Foresight can sufficiently guard against the Arts and Contrivances of dishonest and designing Men) yet, so far are the People from not being allowed to judge for themselves, that if they find him preaching any heretical Doctrine, or notoriously scandalous in his moral Character, they have then Liberty to complain; and if their Complaints are properly preferred, and duely supported, they will not fail of having that *unworthy Person removed from among them*.

By this Time, you may possibly perceive, that what you call *a most excellent Doctrine to promote Popery in Spain, Mahometism in Turkey, Paganism in Japan*, does not at all flow from Mr. White's Principles, nor from
what

what is required of the People, in these Matters by our Church; but is merely the Creature of that erroneous Consequence you yourself have drawn from them.

As to the Question you put concerning "the Protestants of *France*, whether they have unwarrantably and wickedly withdrawn from the Ministers, which the King, and Bishops, had set over them?" Since you do not like the Answer Mr. *White* has given, I shall only observe, that it will be Time enough to find you another, when you have proved your own Case and theirs to be parallel; that is, when you have proved the Church of *England*, both in its Doctrine and its Discipline, to be equally corrupt with the Church of *Rome*, and that it requires Things as impious and absurd, to be both believed and practised by its Members, as that did of them: For till this be done, what they did can be nothing to your Purpose.

But lastly, to Mr. *White's* having urged that, according to your System, the Minority of a Parish are bound to submit to the Choice of the Majority; so if these happen to chuse a Popish Priest for their Pastor, those are obliged to receive him as such: You Answer, that it "is an Absurdity that cannot be charged upon your Principles and Reasoning, there being not a Syllable in your Letter favouring such a Submission; but it expressly claims and maintains the Right of every Man to judge and chuse for himself (a)." But, however expressly you maintain this Right of the People in your Writings, Mr. *White* has shewn, that it is often manifestly infringed in your

your Practice: And indeed, it must many Times necessarily be so; because, otherwise, it would be morally impossible to keep your Congregations together. For let a Vacancy be supposed in any of your Churches, upon the Death of the Minister, or other Cause, for which two, three, or more Competitors may offer themselves, each supported by a different Party; now, according to your Principles, each Party must have a Right to adhere to the Minister it votes for; and if it pleases to divide from the others, the same may be done again in these smaller Divisions, till they divide so long, that they come to nothing: For you know who has said, *if a House be divided against itself, that House cannot stand* (a).

Having now considered every Reason and every Authority alledged by you, in Support of the Peoples Right to chuse their own Pastors, and evinced it, I hope, not to have been by divine Appointment, I come to your XIth Section, which is to prove,

The Burial Office and Atbanasian Creed most apparently inconsistent, and repugnant to each other.

But as I have considered this Objection in my Remarks upon your VIth, I shall pass it over; as I should have done by your XIIth, which has for its Title, *The Scottish Presbyterian Establishment vindicated*, (my Design being not to interfere with what is done by other Churches, but only to vindicate the Practice of our own) had it not been for one Assertion, wherein our Church is concerned; the Validity of which, I must beg leave to consider, before I go on to your XIIIth.

You

(a) Mark iii. 25.

You say, that “ the very Canons of the Church
 “ of *England*, to which we have sworn Obe-
 “ dience, acknowledge the Church of *Scotland*,
 “ to be a true Sister Church ; commanding all
 “ its *Clergy* to pray for the Churches of *England*,
 “ *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, as *Parts of Christ’s*
 “ *holy Catholick Church, which is dispersed through-*
 “ *out the World.*” And then you add, “ *Note,*
 “ the Church of *Scotland*, when these Canons
 “ were made, was *Presbyterian* as it is now.”

In Answer to which, I observe, that *Rapin* in-
 forms us (a), there were Bishops in *Scot-*
land, at the Time the Church of *Scotland* was
 put into our LVth Canon, though, indeed, di-
 vested of all ecclesiastical Authority and Juris-
 diction ; but then they were divested, by the
 Authority of the Kirk only, without the Consent
 or Concurrence of the Legislature ; for he owns,
 that Bishops were never directly set aside by the
 Authority of the Legislature of that King-
 dom (b) ; now, it not being the Doctrine of our
 Bishops and Clergy, that the spiritual Rulers
 of any Church, whether they consist of Bishops
 and Clergy, as with us, or of Ministers and
 ruling Elders, as with you, have Authority to
 reform the Church of any Nation, without the
 Approbation and Concurrence of the Legisla-
 ture of the People, they might have looked upon
 the Deprivation of the Bishops, and Alteration
 of the Church of *Scotland*, from an episcopal
 to a presbyterian Form, not to have been made
 by a due and legal Authority ; and, consequently,
 might still have deemed that Church Episcopal,
 not-

(a) *Tindal’s Transl.* Vol. II. p. 289. Col. 1. (b) Ditto,
 p. 298.

notwithstanding the Change that had been made in it by the Authority of the Kirk only. Besides, it is not improbable, but that King *James I.* (in the first Year of whose Reign our Canons were made) had given Archbishop *Bancroft* Assurance, that he would restore Bishops to their ecclesiastical Power in that Church, as soon as possibly he could; for there had been a Correspondence between them, during the Decline of Queen *Elizabeth's* Life; and, by the Influence of that Archbishop's Counsel, it is supposed, those Acts were passed in *Scotland*, some few Years before that King left it, which were thought apparently designed to pave the Way for the Restoration of Episcopacy, and whereby *he was indeed* enabled to do it (a): For these Reasons, therefore, the Church of *Scotland* might have been inserted very consistently in our LVth Canon, to be prayed for with the Churches of *England* and *Ireland*, without being esteemed as truly *presbyterian* as it is now; but, on the contrary, a true Sister Church, though at that Time labouring under some undue and illegal Restraints. This is what I had to say to your Assertion, that when the Church of *Scotland* was put into our LVth Canon, it was *Presbyterian* as it is now. I proceed, therefore, to Section XIII. which is,

Of the Churches Authority in Controversies of Faith.

This, in your first Letter, you are pleased to turn into *Matters of Faith*, and *Points of Faith*. Whether you had any meaning in your so doing or not, you yourself best know; however, you ought

(a) *Heylin's Hist. of Presb.* p. 355.

ought to have kept strictly to the Letter of the Article: Because *Matters of Faith* and *Points of Faith* are Expressions of greater Latitude than *Controversies of Faith*; and may lead a prejudiced and unwary Reader to imagine, that our Church assumed an Authority to make a Thing a Matter of Faith, or a Point of Faith, which was not made such by the holy Scriptures; which is what it never once pretends to claim; and is, indeed, an Authority which belongs to no Powers upon Earth, whether ecclesiastical or civil. But to return. What is meant by the Churches having *Authority in Controversies of Faith*, is only this, that when any Doubt or Dispute arises concerning any Article of Faith, the Decisions of the spiritual Rulers of the Church are to be submitted to, and not the Judgment and Opinions of private Men; and where Persons will still continue refractory and contentious, there the civil Magistrate is to interpose, and require them to be submissive, or at least silent, by the Force of temporal Penalties (a), which the spiritual Part of the Church had no Right to injoin. And without some such Authority in the Church, How would it be possible to keep up Unity of Doctrine, or, indeed, any Unity at all in it? Are Men to be left at Liberty to set up private Opinion against private Opinion; and to dispute and wrangle on without End; to the continual Vexation of the Peaceable, and to the perverting of weak and unstable Minds? The Authors of the Vindication of the Presbyterial Government and Ministry, who thought themselves, no doubt, very competent Judges in this Matter, saw the
Necessity

(a) *Baxter's Holy Comm. Wealth, Thesis 236.*

Necessity for this Power's being in the Church, and laid as strong a Claim to it, as ever the Church of *England* can : For, writing against some Sectaries of their Time, who maintained that *the Christian Magistrate was the Fountain and Original of Church Government* ; among some other Reasons against it, they offer this as one, *viz.* because *this Assertion* (that is, that the Christian Magistrate is the Fountain and Original of Church Government) *denieth an intrinsical Power to the Church to preserve itself in Unity, to purge out spiritual Defilements, and to take Care for its own Preservation, against Church-destroying Enemies and Iniquities* (a). Now, how can the Church keep *itself in Unity* ; how can it *purge out spiritual Defilements* ; and take Care for its own Preservation against Church-destroying Enemies and Iniquities ; without having this very Authority in Controversies of Faith ? And in whom is this Authority lodged ? Why, undoubtedly, according to them, in those whom in Page 49 they have endeavoured to prove to be *firstly* and *especially* the Church, that is, their Ministers and ruling Elders. Hence you see, that, even in the Opinion of your own Party, such an Authority ought to be in the Church. And if so, if what has been said upon your ninth Section, concerning the Ordination of your Ministers, has any Weight, our Bishops and Clergy must have a much better Claim to it, than your Ministers and ruling Elders can pretend to.

But you say, that *if this Authority be in the Church, the Reformation cannot be justified : For the Church of Rome surely had it before the Church of England ; even at the Time the Reformation*

L

was

(a) P. 10, 11.

was made; consequently, the first Reformers were guilty of great Petulancy and ecclesiastical Rebellion, in refusing to submit to the Church's solemn Determinations concerning Image Worship, Transubstantiation, &c. and in proudly setting up their own private Opinions against the authoritative Decisions of their ecclesiastical Superiours, to whom they owed Submission, and whom they ought to have obeyed (a). But pray, Sir, Where do you find, that we of the Church of England have ever owned the Church of Rome to be the Church, in the Sense you have here insinuated, to the Decisions of which all other Churches ought to submit and obey? Which is what you should have made appear, and that too in the plainest Manner, before your Argument, in this Place, against our Reformation, ought to be allowed to have any Weight at all. That the Church of Rome, as a national Church, had this Authority, and still has, as well as all other national Churches, is undeniably true; and had it gone no further, no other Church would have had any Thing to do with it: But when the Bishop of that Church began to set himself up as universal Pastor over the Church of Christ; and, as such, to extend his Authority, very unjustly, over all other Churches; this was, undoubtedly, an unscriptural Usurpation; and consequently, it could not have been any petulancy or ecclesiastical Rebellion, in our first Reformers, to take the first Opportunity, to free themselves from an illegal and unscriptural Usurpation. And upon this Consideration, I hope, the Reformation of our Church may be truly justified, without giving up its Claim to
this

(a) 3 Letter, p. 85.

this Authority, which would only serve to render it liable to be torn to Pieces, by Hereticks and Schismaticks of all Denominations, that hitherto have, or may hereafter, take Occasion, from thence, to set themselves up in it.

You say, moreover, that *this Claim of our Church, is an unanswerable Argument in Favour of Popery*. But to whom can it be such an unanswerable Argument in Favour of Popery, but to those, who look upon the Church of *Rome* to be *the Church*, as you, in the foregoing Quotation, have been pleased to call it? But this is a Point the Church of *England*, ever since the Reformation, has disputed with it; and does maintain, that, from Right or Reason either, that Church can have no more Authority over the Church of *England*, than the Church of *England* over that; that is, in Reality, none at all. And, I believe, that whoever yields up this Point, that is, that the Church of *Rome* is *the Church*, does give a much more unanswerable Argument, in Favour of Popery, than the Church of *England* does, by this Claim. For if that Church be granted to be the Church, to which all others owe Submission and Obedience, it would be able, more readily, to deduce its Claim to Authority in Controversies of Faith, and also, to our Obedience to its solemn Determinations concerning Image Worship, Transubstantiation, and what not, than from the Church of *England's* asserting this Authority in Controversies of Faith to be in the Church (but no more in the Church of *Rome* than in any other national Church) to prove the Church of *Rome* to be that Church, to whose Determinations all other Churches ought

to submit. And if there have been some few, who have mistaken the Sense of our XXth Article to their own Perversion, (for you must excuse me, if I cannot help thinking you greatly out, when you talk of Thousands) what wonder would it be, when there are not wanting those, who wrest even the holy Scriptures to their own Destruction? Yet I must observe, that if there have been any such, it can only have been those, who, as you have done, have taken the Church of *Rome* to be *the Church* in the highest Sense: I say, as you have done; For if any one will carefully peruse the Argument, in the foregoing Quotation, whereby you would prove the Reformation to be unjustifiable, he will find the whole Strength of it to rest solely and intirely upon your supposing that Church to be *the Church* in so high a Sense, that all Departure from it must be unlawful.

You conclude this Paragraph with saying,
 “ Nor can all the Learning or Wit of the whole
 “ Clergy of the Land withstand the Force of
 “ a single Jesuit, let him be armed with, and
 “ wield skilfully, this dangerous Weapon, the
 “ XXth Article of our Church.” I am surprized that a Gentleman, who does not seem to want Sense, should make such a Mountain of this Molehill; for were the meanest Clergyman in capacity, of this Nation, only to require the acutest Jesuit of them all to prove his Church to be the Church to which all other Churches ought to submit; and to shew, in any Part of the holy Scripture, that either Jesus Christ himself, or his Apostles, have ever so much as once intimated that there was to be one universal Pastor over the Church upon
 Earth;

Earth; or, if they had, to prove, that the Bishop of *Rome* was to be that Pastor; I fancy this, which you call so dangerous a Weapon in the Hands of a Jesuit, were he able to wield it ever so skilfully, would be effectually wrested out of them. For if he be not able to prove these Points, as, I think I may venture to say, I am sure he can not; what Advantage can possibly be drawn, from our XXth Article, in Favour of Popery, or the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, any more than of any other national Church whatever? What I mean by a national Church is, that when the Bishops and Clergy of any Nation have met and agreed upon such a Form of Doctrine, as is clearly deducible from the holy Scripture; and such a Manner of divine Worship, as, without contradicting any known Rule thereof, is most agreeable to the Constitution or Genius of any People; and when these have been assented to and established by the People in their Legislative Capacity; then those Bishops Clergy and People, collectively, make up one compleat national Church; and every Church, so constituted, is truly a Member of the holy Catholick Church; and a Number of such Members compleat the whole, united under one and the same Head in Heaven, Jesus Christ the great Bishop of Souls: And whether to have the Doctrine of the Church, as contained in the holy Scripture, thus drawn up by those, who have made the Study of them the Business of their Lives, even the Bishops and Pastors thereof, and then set forth, by their and the civil Authority, for the Direction of the Peoples Judgment, be not a more likely Means to promote their Unity, Peace and Edification,

fication, than to leave them, without any such
 Direction at all, *to be carried to and fro with*
every Blast of Doctrine, by the cunning Craftiness
of those, who continually lie in wait to deceive,
 I need only leave it to every candid and judi-
 cious Reader to decide; nay, and I might
 add, whether it be not the best Means too to
 preserve them from Popery, seemingly so much
 dreaded by you, into which Mr. Baxter has
declared, that Thousands had been driven, or con-
firmed in it, by your loose and dividing Principles;
 for which he has given this Reason, because,
 “ by the Odium and Scorn of our Disagreements,
 “ Inconsistencies, and multiplied Sects, they
 “ (that is the Papists) will persuade People,
 “ that we must come for Unity to them, or
 “ else run mad, and crumble into Dust and
 “ Individuals ;” and has added, that he “ was
 “ persuaded, that all Arguments else in *Bellarmin,*
 “ and all other Books that ever were written,
 “ have not done so much to make Papists in
 “ *England,* as the Multitude of Sects among
 “ ourselves (a).” Now this Multitude of Sects
 has been the Fruit of such Principles as yours;
 and therefore, if what Mr. Baxter has said be
 true, who was a very warm and zealous Writer
 against the Church of *England*; whether you,
 by advancing such Principles as necessarily tend
 to divide the People and multiply Sects among
 them, or our Church, in claiming such an *Auth-*
ority in Controversies of Faith as may serve to
 keep them together in Unity of Doctrine, be
 most likely to promote the Cause of Popery,
 I shall leave to yourself seriously and impartially
 to

(a) *Stillington's Unreasonableness of Separation, Preface,*
 p. 28, 29.

to consider ; and proceed to the last Thing I have to take Notice of before I have done with this Section.

You argue, moreover, that, “ to whomsoever God gives *Authority in Controversies of Faith* he gives also *Infallibility* incontestibly appears hence, viz. that else a Man might really have *Authority* from the God of *Truth* to lead Men into *Error* ; he might have a *Power*, a *Right*, from Heaven to seduce and decieve. The Absurdity of which glares at first View, and need no further to be exposed.” But are there, Sir, no Degrees in Authority with you ? Must it always necessarily be absolute ? Now, if the Authority meant in our XXth Article be not absolute, there is certainly no need of Infallibility to direct the Use of it. But that an absolute Authority was not intended in that Article, is manifest from that which immediately precedes, and that which immediately follows it ; for in the XIXth, *the Churches of Hierusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome also, are declared to have erred, not only in their Living and Manner of Ceremonies, but also in Matters of Faith* ; and in the XXIst it is said, that even general Councils may err, and sometimes have erred, in Things pertaining to God : From whence it is concluded, that Things ordained by them as necessary to Salvation, have neither Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declared, that they be taken out of holy Scripture : The Compilers, therefore, of our Articles did not write, upon this Occasion, like those, who deemed the *Authority in Controversies of Faith*, declared to be in the Church, in our XXth Article, to be an absolute Authority, which re-

quired Infallibility to direct it, and which was, upon all Occasions, implicitly to be submitted to; but rather like those, who maintained, that the Exposition of the spiritual Governours of the Church, concerning any controverted Point of the Christian Doctrine, ought to have so much Weight and Authority, as to satisfy the Minds of the People, and to keep the Church in Unity and Peace. But I hasten to your XIVth and last Section,

Of the Posture in which our Lord and his Apostles eat the sacramental Supper.

In speaking of which you say, in the first Place, “ that it is most certain, that they eat it in their Table-Gesture, whatever that was; “ it was the *Gesture*, in which they were wont “ to take their *Food* at Meals. This is all we “ need to know, to justify our Practice: Our “ Lord and his Apostles took the Sacrament in “ an *eating*, not in an *adoring* Posture. Let “ no Man then think himself *wiser*; or pretend, that he can take it in a more *bumble*, “ *devout*, and *fitter* Posture than *they*.” That our Saviour knew what Posture was fittest for this Purpose no Man can deny; and so did God undoubtedly know, in what Posture it was meetest for the People of *Israel* to celebrate their Passover, when he ordered them *to eat it with their Loins girded, their Shoes on their Feet, and their Staff in their Hand, and to eat it in Haste* (a): Here we find the Manner, in which the *Jews* were to eat the Passover, to have been expressly appointed by God himself, (which yet, be it observed,

(a) Exod. xii. 11.

served, is more than the Posture, in which the Disciples were to receive the sacramental Supper, ever was by Christ) and yet the Jewish Church took the Liberty to alter it for their common Table-Gesture; and so far were they from being reprov'd for it by our blessed Saviour, that he was pleas'd to conform unto it himself. Had the Jewish Church then the Power to change the Manner, in which they were so expressly order'd by God himself to eat the Passover, without being reprov'd for it by him, who undoubtedly had the justest Authority to do it; and shall not the Christian Church have the Liberty, even where no Posture has been appointed, to order that which shall seem most fit and proper for receiving the Lord's Supper? Shall it be allowable for Persons to receive but temporal Favours from an earthly Sovereign, in a kneeling Posture; and shall it be esteem'd unlawful for them to commemorate the greatest Blessing, and to receive spiritual Food and Sustenance for their immortal Souls from the great King of Heaven, in one so devout and humble? *The Absurdity of which (to use your own Words upon another Occasion) glares at first View, and needs no further to be expos'd.*

After this you display your Learning, in order to prove that sitting was the more ancient Posture. Now, admitting this to be true, yet, What would it be to your Purpose? Since the Question is not about what was the Posture more anciently in use, but what it was in our Saviour's Time. But your Authorities only tend to shew, what was the Custom of the more western Parts of the World; whereas, in the Eastern,

Eastern, there is very great Reason for believing it to have been quite otherwise; and that the recumbent Posture was very anciently in use among the *Jews*; for, in the Book of *Ezekiel*, who prophesied about the Beginning of the Babylonish Captivity, the Prophetesses, who *prophefied out of their own Heart*, are compared to those *who sewed Pillows to all Arm-holes (a)*; now, as these Prophetesses seem to have adapted their Prophecies to the Humour and Inclination of the People they had to deal with, so they, who sewed Pillows to all Arm-holes, made them so as to suit the Stature of every one who was to make use of them, that he might lie more commodious and easy; for if a Person with a long Arm had been to have had a low Pillow, the Weight of his Body must frequently have lain too much upon the Elbow; and if one with a short Arm was to have had a high Pillow, the Weight of his Body must have lain altogether upon it, without his being able to relieve himself by resting sometimes upon his Elbow; the Prophet then seems plainly to have had the recumbent Posture in View in this Place; and if so, it is not improbable, that it was in common use long before, even as high as, if not even higher than, the Time in which *Homer* himself is supposed to have wrote; who is the most ancient Writer of those, you have taken your Authorities from: For it is not to be supposed, that the Prophet would have taken an Allusion from a Custom but little known, or just then introduced. And so much for the Antiquity of the recumbent Posture among the *Jews*. I shall now prove, and that from irrefragable

(a) Ezekiel xiii. 17, 18.

fragable Authority, that it was also in common use among them, at their ordinary Meals, even in our Saviour's Time. *St. Luke* tells us, that, as our Saviour sat at Meat in a Pharisee's House, *a Woman brought an Alabaster Box of Ointment, and stood at his Feet behind him Weeping, and began to wash his Feet with Tears, and did wipe them with the Hair of her Head, and kissed his Feet, and anointed them with the Ointment (a)*; which would have been utterly impossible for her to have done, had he sat at Table with his Feet dependent, as the modern Table-Gesture is, and had he not been in a recumbent Posture, with his Feet upon a Bed; wherefore this single Instance proves, almost to a Demonstration, that the common Table-Gesture of the *Jews*, in our Saviour's Time, must have been recumbent; and therefore, let *Dr. Lightfoot's* Authority, which you think ought not rashly to be attacked, be as great as it will, yet, if he had said (which however, in your Quotation from him, is what he does not appear to have said) that the Recumbent was not the Table-Gesture of the *Jews*, in our Saviour's Time, but that they sat at Table in the Manner you do, when you receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, I might boldly venture to affirm, that he was mistaken: Nay, moreover, that this very Posture was used by our Saviour himself, in celebrating his last Supper, is clearly to be inferred from *St. John's* being said to have leaned at it in our Saviour's Bosom; which Archbishop *Potter (b)*, Mr. *Godwyn (c)*, and Mr. *Basil*

(a) Ch. vii. 37, 38.
p. 377.

(b) Arch. Graec. 2 Vol.

(c) Rites of the ancient Hebr. p. 93.

Basil Kennet (a) (Persons, each of whose Authority may, without offence, I hope, be set against *Dr. Lightfoot's*) account for by the recumbent Posture. If then your changing the recumbent Posture, which so evidently appears to have been used by our Saviour at his last Supper, into a sitting one, is of any Advantage to our Side, in the Controversy between us; it must, you see, bear against you still, with all its Force, notwithstanding all that you have writ, in order to remove it.

I cannot leave this Section, without taking Notice of a small Piece of Misrepresentation you have been guilty of: Not that it, in the least, concerns the Argument in Hand; but only to clear *Mr. White* from an Absurdity, you have very disingenuously endeavoured to fix upon him. You quote him, as telling you, *that the Posture was lying down or along*; and yet, just after, *that it was with the upper Part of the Body erect*; and *that he advises you to try how conveniently a Man may eat and drink in that Posture*: And then you scoffingly add; “ But
 “ to lay my Body down or along, and yet keep
 “ its upper Parts erect, is a Position so extraordinary, that, without the Help of some
 “ Posture Master, or your further good Instructions, I despair of ever compassing so
 “ arduous a Point.” But, in the foregoing Quotation, you have dealt very unfairly, in omitting some Words, which would have explained his Meaning, and shewed it to have been quite otherwise than you have represented it. His own Words are these; “ And in this
 “ Posture, with upper Parts of the Body erect,
 “ in

(a) *Antiquit. of Rome*, p. 369.

“ *in the Manner above described*, they might eat
 “ mighty well, and drink also conveniently
 “ enough, as this Gentleman may be satisfied,
 “ if he will only try it.” By those Words, *in the Manner above described*, he plainly refers to what he had been saying, throughout the whole Note, from whence your Quotation was taken, which was to prove, that, in the recumbent Posture, whilst a Person lay down, or along upon a Bed, the upper Part of his Body was raised, by a Pillow, or something else, for his Convenience and Ease: Wherefore, whatever *erect* may, strictly speaking, signify; yet, limited as it was by those Words, *in the Manner above described*, which you have left out, it plainly shews Mr. *White*’s Meaning not to have been so absurd, as to advise you, or any one else, to try to lie along and sit upright at the same Time.

The CONCLUSION.

I have now, Sir, followed you through every Section of your third Letter, wherein the Church of *England* was concerned; and, I hope, I have made it appear, that your Objections against it are really owing to Mistake or Misrepresentation. And if the Church of *England* is a true Member of the truly Catholick Church, notwithstanding what you have writ to prove the contrary, your Separation from it must be unwarrantable: Thus the Authors of *the Vindication of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry* have declared, that *he that doth unwarrantably separate from a true Church, is truly guilty of Schism (a)*: Now Schism is a Sin of so heinous a Nature,

(a) Vindication, &c. p. 137.

a Nature, that it behoves every one, who lies under the least Imputation of it, most strictly and impartially to examine into the Grounds and Reasons of his own Conduct. ~ Such a Scrutiny, is what I would seriously recommend to you and your Brethren ; and, if I were petulantly given, it should be too in your own Words ; “ don’t be afraid of *Truth* : *Truth* “ will never hurt you ; it is a most innocent and “ lovely Thing ; it may rob you of some *Emo-* “ *luments* and *Possessions* of a worldly Nature ; “ but be assured it will give you *something* more “ substantial in their Stead (a).” Whether these Words were directed peculiarly to Mr. *White*, or whether through his Side you made a Thrust at the whole Clergy of this Church, I will not take upon me to say ; however this was, I am sure they carry such a Reflection with them, as can never be reconciled with Christian Charity, or even with common Decency : For how could you have reflected more uncharitably, or more vilely, upon any Man, or Body of Men, than by suggesting, that they were capable of secreting a most important Truth, and of living in open Defiance of it, and consequently against the Convictions of their own Consciences, and all for the Sake of some *Emoluments* and *Possessions of a worldly Nature* ? But if worldly Emoluments must be supposed to have an Influence upon either Party ; all Things considered, the Probability may possibly be found to be much greater, why they should work more forcibly upon the Ministers of Dissenting Congregations, than upon the Clergy of the Church of *England* : For, were all the Clergy of the Church of *Eng-*
land

land to give up the present Establishment, and to declare unanimously for Presbytery, they would have no Reason to apprehend, that they should be stript of their all; because, it is not to be supposed, that they would wantonly and causelessly be turned out of the Livings they now enjoy, only to make Room for others, with whom they would then be of the same Opinion; but it would be quite otherwise with dissenting Ministers; for, were they unanimously to give up the Cause of Presbytery, and to declare for the present Establishment, (unless they had independant Fortunes of their own) their All would be at Stake; there being no Fund, out of which even a bare Competency might be afforded them, neither could they expect to be supported any longer by the voluntary Contributions of their People. For these Reasons, I believe, it will be granted, that the Probability, why dissenting Ministers should be influenced, by worldly Motives, to keep up their Separation, is greater, than that the Clergy of the Church of *England* should be swayed by them to adhere to the present Establishment; and consequently, such Reflections might be made, with a much better Grace, against those than against these. But, for my own Part, I freely acknowledge, all Insinuations and Reflections of this Nature to be very unjustifiable and unchristian: For what has any one to do to judge of the Consciences of others, or to pretend to dive into the secret Motives of their Actions, when *to their own Master* only, even Jesus Christ, *they stand or fall*; who alone knows the Secrets of their Hearts, and will most certainly judge them according thereto, *in that*
Day

Day which God has appointed. In that Day it will undoubtedly appear, who served the Lord out of pure Conscience, and who upon worldly Considerations. Wherefore, leaving this to the Discovery of that great and awful Day, and taking it for granted, that we, each of us, in the mean Time, act from a full Persuasion that we are in the Right, (yet since, where People differ so very widely as we do, one side or the other must necessarily be in the Wrong) I shall conclude, with that excellent Petition of our Litany, *That it may please God to bring into the Way of Truth all such as have erred and are deceived:* And, I hope, there are none, who profess and call themselves Christians, of what Denomination soever they be, and who, as such, are, or at least ought to be, sincerely concerned for the Unity, Peace, and Prosperity of the Church, but will heartily join, and say, *We beseech thee to hear us good Lord.*

I am, Sir,

Your very humble Servant.

F I N I S.
5 0059

E R R A T A.

Page 10, line 9, before Civil for *a*, read *the*. P. 13. l. 26, after find, dele seeing. P. 30. l. 9, for XVII, read VII. Ibid. l. 17, after Sacramental Test begins the Section, Of our Constitution in Church and State. P. 45. l. 21, for would, read could. P. 119, l. ult. before very read as. P. 120, l. 28, for yet read which. P. 135, that Section which begins, What makes this Testimony of St. Jerome, &c. should have been placed at the Bottom of p. 137. by way of Note, to be read after People, l. 11.

